DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 058 SP 034 509

AUTHOR	Cornett, Lynn M.; Gaines, Gayle F.
TITLE	Focusing on Student Outcomes: Roles for Incentive Programs. The 1991 National Survey of Incentive Programs and Teacher Career Ladders.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Jan 92
NOTE	52p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 592 Tenth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30318-5790 ($2.50 handling fee).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; *Career Ladders; Compensation (Remuneration); Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Incentives; National Surveys; Performance Factors; *Policy Formation; Professional Recognition; Program Implementation; *State Programs; Student Role; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Reform Efforts; Southern Regional Education Board

ABSTRACT

In 1986, the Southern Regional Education Board Career Ladder Clearinghouse reported that 29 states were implementing, or had mandates to develop, career ladder or teacher incentive programs based on student performance. The 50-state survey reported on here revisits the issue of teacher and school incentive programs. The report provides a framework for examining: (1) changes that have taken place in states and in schools because of career ladder and reward programs since 1986; (2) the evolution of programs in response to changing fiscal conditions; (3) concerns of policymakers and educators; (4) shifting attitudes about the best way to improve schools; (5) problems arising out of the nation's experiment with incentive programs in the 1980s; and (6) problems states are likely to encounter as they move to accountability systems that focus more on student results in the 1990s. The bulk of the document (30 pages) summarizes survey results from each of the 50 states regarding state actions since 1986. Analysis of the survey results suggest that as a result of career ladder and reward programs, schools emphasizing results for students are becoming more popular. In addition to the text, school and incentive programs--1991 are summarized for each state in chart form. (Contains 21 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Southern Regional Education Board
CAREER LADDER CLEARINGHOUSE

January 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. A. Sullivan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Focusing on Student Outcomes: Roles for Incentive Programs

The 1991 National Survey of Incentive Programs and Teacher Career Ladders

Lynn M. Cornett and Gale F. Gaines

ED358058

In 1986, the SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse reported that teacher incentive programs had "spread like wildfire" since 1983, either as pilot projects or full-scale programs. The Clearinghouse reported that 29 states were implementing or had mandates to develop career ladder or teacher incentive programs, and we asked, "Are they here to stay?" For this report, we have looked back over the five years since 1986 and found:

- ★ In 1986, six states—Arizona, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah—were funding statewide or pilot career ladder projects. In 1992, the same six states and Ohio now fund career ladder programs. Funding has increased in Arizona, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah and has been reduced in North Carolina. Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky proposed career ladder projects that never got off the ground.

- ★ Statewide funding for mentor teacher programs has become popular. In 1986, California and Washington funded statewide mentor teacher programs. Today, nine states fund mentor projects.

- ★ School incentives—with rewards to schools for improving student performance—are on the increase. In 1986, Florida and South Carolina funded school incentive programs to reward schools for progress. In 1992, seven states provide money for school incentive programs; Kentucky has a mandate to begin a program in 1994.

- ★ Pilot projects for districts to develop teacher incentive programs have rarely become statewide programs; however, in several states, mentor teacher programs have evolved out of early efforts. Louisiana has added a model career options program to pay teachers for assuming additional duties. Iowa now funds a statewide teacher incentive/school restructuring program.

- ★ States that provided no money for programs in 1986 have either taken them off the books or ignored them.

For more information, contact:

Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790
(404) 875-9211

SP031509

The evidence is clear that reward and incentive programs are still viable options for states that seek to improve student outcomes. Thousands of teachers and hundreds of schools across about 25 states are receiving awards from career ladder and incentive programs. Some programs have fallen to continued challenges and the budget axe. But, in career ladder programs alone, more than $500 million will be paid to thousands of teachers this year. Since 1983, one state—Tennessee—has put that amount of money in a single state program.

What changes can we point to?

- ★ There appears to be a shifting emphasis from rewarding teachers for what they do to granting rewards for improving student outcomes.
- ★ Several career ladders that were designed to emphasize pay for individual teacher performance have shifted more to professional development or results of team work.
- ★ Teachers are more involved in design of programs, and districts and schools are major players in developing and changing programs.
- ★ Career ladder programs have improved teacher evaluation, and peer teachers are more involved in the evaluation of colleagues.
- ★ Principals have become more involved in instructional issues.
- ★ Change is long term. Experience with these programs indicates that changes in school roles and structures may be more difficult than imagined.
- ★ Research shows that before Arizona's career ladder had an effect on teacher and student performance, districts had to "be ready." They needed school board support, funding, communication, well-aligned curriculum and assessment, and adequate teacher in-service. Outside evaluations of school districts in Utah showed similar patterns.

Can career ladder and incentive programs serve to promote the newest thinking about professionalizing teaching, rewarding outcomes, and emphasizing results? Will they continue to be seen as "add on" programs, or will they become more a part of the fabric—a catalyst for changes in the schools?

One fact is clear: Public and governmental leaders continue to emphasize the importance of incentives to improve teaching.

- ★ National, regional, and state goals have been set. The nation's first report card has been issued. The Southern Regional Education Board will release its second *Educational Benchmarks* report in 1992, showing progress on indicators established for the region in 1988.

- ★ *America 2000* calls for a merit schools program to reward schools for progress and provide differential pay for teachers "who teach well, who teach core subjects, who teach in dangerous and challenging settings, or who serve as mentors for new teachers."

- ★ The National Governors' Association calls for "creating incentives for improvement, including rewards for successes and consequences for failure."

- ★ The 1991 Gallup Poll reports that 69 percent of the public favor merit pay for teachers who teach effectively; 63 percent favor more money for teaching in dangerous new environments; and 49 percent support the concept of teachers serving as mentors for other teachers.

This year's annual survey by the SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse tracks some of the changes that have occurred in state-supported incentive programs across the nation and highlights changes in funding. We continue to ask the question:

What has changed in schools because of career ladder and incentive programs?

Career Ladder Program Changes and Trends

In 1983, serious discussions were underway in the states of Tennessee and Utah to develop career ladder programs. Legislation in 1984 established career ladder programs in both states. Utah's program began with a $15.2 million funding level in 1984-85 and has been funded at $41 million annually for the past several years. The Tennessee program began with annual funds of $62 million in 1985 and reached $100 million in 1991-92.

The Arizona legislature outlined a plan in 1985 that provided $100,000 in development grants for school districts. Funding for the program reached an estimated $21.1 million in 1991-92. The Texas Career Ladder, a four-step plan for teachers, was also created in 1985 and now pays teachers nearly $300 million in state funds annually. Missouri's career ladder plan, created as part of a 1985 reform law, began with a $2.6 million funding level in 1986-87. This year, the career ladder is one of the few state programs that will be spared from budget cuts; its funding will exceed $18 million.

North Carolina is the only state that began a career ladder program in the mid-1980s and subsequently reduced funding. The North Carolina General Assembly mandated a four-year pilot project in 1984 with $12 million in funding. The budget increased to a high mark of $47 million in 1988, and fell to $38 million in 1991-92. During 1989, a differentiated pay plan was also started; the state's 16 career development pilot districts were allowed to continue but with reduced funding. Both programs received cuts for 1991-92.

Several states mandated career ladder programs that were never funded. In 1985, Alabama had problems developing an acceptable evaluation pian. for its career ladder.

Alabama never funded and implemented the program, although the state did fund substantial across-the-board raises originally negotiated as a trade-off for support of the career ladder.

Florida created a Master Teacher Program in 1984 to reward teachers who scored in the top quartile on a test and achieved high marks on an on-the-job evaluation, but the state quickly shut down its program after numerous problems arose. The Florida legislature approved a career ladder plan in 1986-87 but never funded it. Kentucky put money into exploratory work on evaluation for a career ladder plan but did not continue the effort. Delaware provided a small amount of funding to develop a career ladder program, but when no consensus could be reached, the program was dropped.

In 1985, the Georgia State Board of Education developed guidelines and provided minimal funding for a small project that never developed beyond the pilot stage. In 1991, Georgia's Governor appointed a task force that has recommended a schoolwide teacher incentive program.

Ongoing programs have evolved

Most career ladder and teacher incentive programs that remain viable today have evolved in response to changing fiscal conditions, the concerns of policymakers and educators, and shifting attitudes about the best way to improve schools.

The **Tennessee** program has undergone several changes since 1985. Originally, evaluation procedures allowed only the use of state evaluators; now teachers can select a team that includes local principals. The time frame for the total evaluation has been reduced from nine months to one month. A legislative mandate to use student performance outcomes in the evaluation process has been developed only to a minimal degree. Extended contracts for work during the summer were originally available only to career ladder teachers but are now open to all.

The *21st Century Challenge* reform proposal released in 1991 by the Governor and Commissioner of Education says that the improvement of teachers should be "the primary goal of the state's career ladder program." It also calls for greater linkage between career ladder evaluations and programs to help teachers overcome deficiencies. The same concept recently has been endorsed by the Tennessee State Board of Education.

The **North Carolina** Career Development Plan was originally conceived as a career work program for teachers. It was designed to attract and retain high quality teachers and administrators, improve instruction, recognize high quality teaching, and increase the attractiveness of teaching. The plan called for increased responsibility, recognition, and pay—and for increasing the professional skills of teachers. All North Carolina teachers received training based on the effective teaching research used to develop evaluations. The plan provided for bonuses to teachers who met standards, but also required teachers to take on extended responsibilities for additional pay.

North Carolina underwrote a third-party evaluation of its career ladder and made changes based on the results—especially in the evaluation process, which was simplified. Evaluation data are used to help teachers improve and to make decisions about career ladder placement.

In 1989, when Senate Bill 2 gave school districts the option to develop differentiated pay plans, the 16 districts already piloting the Career Development Plan opted to continue it. When funding was cut in 1991 for both plans, the majority of participants in the Career Development Plan districts made high-performance bonuses their first priority—and districts then reduced or eliminated extended employment, staff development, and other program support that were part of their Career Development Plans.

The **Utah** Career Ladder Program has four major parts: performance bonus, job enlargement, extended contract day, and the career ladder. Performance bonus recognizes and rewards excellence in the classroom. Job enlargement provides extra pay for extra work. Extended days provides for paid, non-teaching days beyond the regular school year.

In 1988, the state director of the Utah plan made this observation: "We started with the notion that this was a teacher pay plan. It is not a teacher pay plan. It is a plan to increase student performance by enhancing the teaching profession." Utah's original intent was to provide professional and financial incentives and create a differentiated staffing system. Initially, districts had to put at least 50 percent of the funding into career ladder and bonus payments for individual teachers. The 1991 legislature added a provision that makes teams of teachers eligible to receive money. Third-party evaluations also showed differences in the readiness of districts to implement a new program . An Arizona study produced a similar finding (Cornett, August 1988; Cornett and Gaines, 1991).

In 1991, the Utah State Office of Education surveyed teachers about the Utah Career Ladder Program—following up on a similar study in 1985. According to its authors, the study reflects a "broad base of experience with the career ladder concept" during the six years of Utah's program. Overall, teachers were more positive about the program in 1991 than in 1985. The study also found that:

- A majority of teachers said the career ladder program had made teaching more attractive and would continue to do so in the future (98 percent reported participating).

- Teachers said the program had a positive impact on their own delivery of instruction (38 percent reported a "very great" or "substantial" impact) and on the instructional climate in the school; 90 percent said that the program provided opportunities for teachers to take on different and specialized instructional roles, such as mentor or teacher leader.

- Three-fifths of the teachers saw the program as having at least a "moderately positive" influence on student achievement and predicted it might have a greater impact in the future.

- Teachers are using extra contract days for planning and in-service. Some teachers are using them for meeting with parents of students.

- In general, teachers thought teacher evaluation had improved.

- Teachers were most positive about the effect of the extended contract year on morale. They were also positive, although to a lesser extent, about performance bonuses and extra pay for extra work.

- Nearly 80 percent of the teachers said that outstanding teaching was recognized and rewarded in the performance bonus part of the plan.

- Over 90 percent reported the program was contributing to other areas of educational reform, such as improving curriculum, implementing a student educational plan, and providing in-service training.

- Over half of the teachers (53 percent) said student progress should not be a factor in teacher evaluation; about 30 percent said it should.

- A majority of teachers surveyed supported continuation of the program. The greatest support came from elementary teachers with 10 years or less of experience (Nelson and Ross, September 1991).

The **Iowa** Educational Excellence Program, started in 1987, includes a provision known as "Phase III"—an incentive program for teachers. The program was intended to improve the quality, effectiveness, and performance of Iowa's teachers through supplemental and performance-based plans. In 1990, the plan was changed to encourage more fundamental change through school innovations. Under the new plan, districts design programs to increase student learning, teaching, and organizational effectiveness. One example is a master learning project for high school social studies. The project resulted in improvement in student achievement scores. Another district provided training in cooperative learning techniques for teachers and set aside meeting time for idea-sharing. One district used a cadre of teachers and principals to develop school improvement plans and gave schools the authority to plan for the expenditure of funds from the program. The district reported that teachers have assumed leadership positions with new roles and responsibilities (Iowa Department of Education, 1991).

The **Arizona** Career Ladder experience provides a rather different perspective. The plan, which allowed districts to design programs under state guidelines, had some unique characteristics from the beginning.

1. The program requires districts to change the total compensation structures for teachers, which prevents the career ladder from being treated as just an "add-on."

2. The ultimate goal and focus of the program is improved student achievement.

3. Teacher evaluations are linked to student performance.

4. Long-term, third-party evaluation was conducted during the pilot years.

These characteristics have resulted in a state program that is perceived not as an "extra" but as a fundamental change in the way teachers are evaluated and compensated. The long-term, third-party evaluation created opportunities to revise existing provisions and fashion new approaches based on hard research. The in-depth research led to a better understanding of the organizational changes that had to occur to put a program in place and the challenges to be overcome in developing new roles for teachers. The research also underscored the value of individual accountability for student progress and of professional development tied to clear program goals.

When the Arizona pilot program expanded statewide, several changes took place. Oversight moved from the legislature to the State Board of Education. New guidelines call for all new teachers in a district to participate (pilot districts had voluntary participation). Teacher evaluation is tied directly to the demonstration of higher-level teaching skills and to student progress. Multiple evaluators are used, and teachers at the top rung must take on additional responsibilities.

Thirteen of the 14 Arizona districts in the program have applied for a higher level of funding (from 5.0 percent to 5.5 percent above the base level). To receive higher funding, specific, more difficult criteria must be set by districts and met by participants. As a result, districts are developing models for student assessment that include test results, writing samples, creative projects, and assessment of higher order skills. Districts report that they have completely redesigned teacher evaluation, student assessment, and staff development programs as a result of the program. An ongoing district network for sharing information has been one key to program success. In a study that included all districts in the state, teachers cited the opportunities to earn extra money and engage in professional growth as the most attractive features of the program. Paperwork and teacher workloads are areas of concern (Fuller, 1990).

As the 1991-92 school year begins, **Texas** will enter the eighth year of its teacher incentive program. The Texas Teacher Career Ladder will be funded at about $283 million for school year 1991-92 and $287 million for school year 1992-93. The program was funded at similar levels the prior two years.

Texas teachers advance up the career ladder by performing well in the classroom as indicated by scores on the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS), by meeting specific job-related education requirements, and by meeting experience (tenure) requirements at a prior level. The professional staff development may be formal higher education courses or workshops. Performance appraisals are used to determine whether teachers remain at advanced levels.

In 1991, at the request of the new Commissioner of Education, the Texas legislature authorized an initiative intended to help schools increase learning outcomes for all students and close the performance gaps among various student populations. The Partnership Schools Initiative seeks to cut across existing programs, delivery systems, and barriers or constraints to concentrate the efforts of the state and participating districts on: (1) the student;

(2) the real world outcomes necessary for that student; and (3) the program or programs necessary for that student to reach the identified, desired outcomes.

The Texas Teacher Appraisal System (used for the career ladder program) relies heavily on observation of classroom practice to make decisions about effective and ineffective teaching and "better" and "best" teaching. In a new opinion study, over 81 percent of the principals, 74 percent of the superintendents, and 68 percent of the teachers surveyed thought appraisers could discriminate extremes of effective and ineffective teaching practices. An average of 59 percent felt that appraisers could discriminate a full range of teaching practices. But the study found that "for all practical purposes, only two classifications were actually used—'exceeds expectations' and 'clearly outstanding'." The report noted that since high levels of performance are needed to move up the ladder, appraisers may be reluctant to give teachers average or below average scores (Texas Education Agency, 1991).

These concerns are mirrored in a recent SREB study of state evaluation systems that emphasize observational data. It questioned whether observation systems alone are effective in making decisions about better and best teaching practice—in contrast to the simpler task of judging a teacher's ability to meet a set of standards for basic competency or to obtain an initial license to teach (SREB, 1991).

Early efforts in **Ohio** resulted in a recommendation that districts develop local incentive programs with state assistance, as opposed to the implementation of a statewide career ladder program. A number of successful pilot projects were initiated with state funding. In 1989, the legislature authorized the Department of Education to develop a statewide plan to phase in merit pay and career ladder programs. The plan, submitted to the legislature in December 1990, is designed to guide districts in developing locally financed incentive programs. Experiences from other states, as well as the early pilots in Toledo and Arlington, were used in developing the state guidelines included in the plan. District-designed programs are to "improve the quality of educational experiences and performance of students and to enhance the career of teaching," and are to include input from teachers and administrators. Local evaluation and a five-year review by the Department of Education are also essential in developing programs (Ohio Department of Education, December 1990).

Another pilot project has led to the development of a program and guidelines. The **Louisiana** Model Career Options Program (legislated in 1988) is to provide opportunities for teachers to expand professional roles, advance in their careers, receive more salary based on performance, and to provide school systems with additional services by expanding the use of teachers. The Model Career Options program, developed by a statewide committee, provides teachers with salary bonuses for performance and opportunities to take on new and expanded responsibilities. It also lets districts use talented teachers to provide additional services.

In the fall of 1991, about 500 eligible Louisiana teachers who participated in the program received average additional pay of $2,620. Teachers also receive $300 to cover the cost of supplies, travel, and other expenses related to the program. In the 1991-92 school year, each teacher will receive 11.73 percent of the minimum state teacher's salary as a bonus. The program is voluntary for teachers who have seven years of experience, at least a

master's degree, and a superior rating under the statewide evaluation system. The statewide evaluation system has been reviewed by a team from outside the state and is undergoing revisions.

In Louisiana's Career Options Program, teachers can work with other teachers as mentors (in the case of new teachers), or as peer consultants. In a second option, teachers can choose to provide supplemental instructional programs for students, such as enrichment or remediation. A third choice is to work with school faculty at one or more schools or at the district level in staff development or curriculum development. Participating teachers develop action plans in consultation with their principal or central office staff.

Increasing the Number of Mentor Teacher Programs

In 1986, only California and Washington were operating statewide mentor teacher programs. Seven states (California, Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Oregon, Washington, and West Virginia) now have statewide mentor teacher programs.

The **California** Teacher Mentor Program has grown steadily in its eight years of funding. Currently, over 10,000 mentor teachers work with 16,000 new teachers and receive an average of $4,300 in additional pay annually. Districts receive an additional $2,100 to offset the cost of training and release time for each mentor. The program originally funded 4,300 mentor teachers with $31 million; by 1986, it paid out about $45 million. An estimated $65 million will be available for 1992.

In 1989, **Idaho** initiated a mentor program for first-year teachers and administrators. For each first-year certified employee, districts receive $1,000 that can be used for supplemental pay and release time, professional growth activities for first-year personnel, or for contracts with higher education institutions to provide assistance to the beginning teachers and administrators. **Indiana**'s $2 million appropriation provides each mentor teacher with $600 and the district with $200 per mentor to provide release time. In 1990, the **West Virginia** legislature created a mentor teacher program as part of a comprehensive package of reforms. Funded at $1.5 million, guidelines provide support teams for beginning teachers that include the principal, a county staff development council member, and an experienced classroom teacher. Joint planning periods are provided and trained mentor teachers receive $600 compensation. The 1991 **Virginia** legislature funded a grant program in which some one-third of the state's school divisions received $10,000 to develop mentor teacher programs. **Minnesota** continues to fund pilot projects.

While programs in Connecticut and Washington continue, state funding has been reduced due to the current economic downturn. **Connecticut** will spend $3 million to support 1,000 beginning teachers who are paired with trained mentors; last year, an $8 million fund supported 1,200 beginning teachers. The Teacher Assistance Program in **Washington** is operating with $2.3 million for the biennium (down from $3.7 million). This year 600 mentors are teamed with one teacher or other educational personnel compared to last year's 1,000

teams. **Oregon** has also reduced funding due in part to the economy but also because a low turnover rate among experienced teachers has caused fewer new teachers to be hired. Funding for the current biennium was reduced from $3.9 million to $3 million for up to 650 teacher/mentor teams. Districts in **Pennsylvania** are required to implement school-based induction programs as part of state certification requirements. No funds are earmarked for these programs; districts use formula funds to carry out the state mandate.

Statewide mentor teacher programs are under development in **Hawaii**, **Massachusetts**, **Montana**, and **South Dakota**. Discussions relating to the creation of such programs are underway in **Rhode Island** and **Wisconsin**.

School Incentive Programs

The recent trend in incentive programs has been toward plans that provide funding to schools for instructional purposes, not salaries. Money goes to schools for meeting standards on outcomes, such as student achievement, reduction in dropout rates, or progress over time. While the number of school incentive programs has steadily grown, funding has been reduced this year in several states due to the economic downturn. On the other hand, the Texas program has been expanded, and a new program under development in South Carolina provides money to school staff. A Governor's Task Force on Merit Pay in Georgia recently proposed bonuses for teachers based on schoolwide improvement.

South Carolina added a campus incentive program to its school incentive reward program—now in its seventh year. Funding for the school incentive program in 1991 reached $5 million—or about $30 per student—compared to $4.4 million in 1990. During the 1991 legislative session, the *Campus Incentive Program* was established to reward faculty members of schools that demonstrate superior performance and productivity. Principals, assistant principals, teachers, library media specialists, guidance counselors, psychologists, school nurses and others—as determined by an advisory committee—will be eligible to participate in the program.

Funding of $17 million was allocated for South Carolina's campus incentive program, with $10.5 million to be spent to reward teachers and $3.46 million for principals and other faculty. The remaining $3.1 million "may be used by school districts and any school to compensate faculty for their time and effort in the area of school improvement and planning, and such activities as research, curriculum development, coordination of courses and special projects, or other activities the faculty may wish to undertake for improving student performance, development, and learning, and coordination of services with other social and health agencies."

A 20-member Campus Incentive Advisory Committee has been appointed by the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent, and the Governor. The committee will advise the State Board of Education on development and implementation of the program. The Campus Incentive Program will replace two programs (Teacher Incentive and Principal Incentive) that were developed as a result of the Education Improvement Act of 1984.

The **Louisiana** School Incentive Program (funded at $150,000 in 1991-92 for a third year of development) is designed to reward schools that make significant progress and to increase local accountability. The pilot phase continues to test the standards for selecting award recipients. Some 50 schools received cash awards, with another 300 schools receiving flags and certificates. (Schools are grouped into similar categories based on such factors as socio-economic status of students, size of school, and geographic location.) The cash awards will be used for instruction, not to increase salaries. School councils of teachers, community members, and students will assist the principals in determining use of the award.

Legislation passed during the July 1991 Special Session made changes in the **Texas** Educational Excellence school incentive program. The new program, "Texas Successful Schools," is under development and will "recognize or reward those schools and school districts that demonstrate progress or success in achieving the educational goals of the state." Schools that demonstrate the greatest improvement in achieving goals will be presented financial rewards by the Governor. Rewards will be calculated based on a predetermined amount for each student ($30 million has been appropriated for the biennium). Additional non-monetary awards may be given to schools that meet or exceed goals.

The Texas Commissioner of Education is directed to appoint a committee to determine criteria and recipients of the awards. Each school's performance will be compared to previous performance. In addition, each school district will develop plans for site-based decision-making by December 1992. Training will be available to teachers, principals, and school board trustees. Teachers will participate in school intervention teams that will conduct on-site assessments of low performing schools and work with school staff to develop school improvement plans.

Washington's Schools for the 21st Century program will be funded at $10 million for the biennium—a figure that includes no increase. **Kentucky**'s plan, based on school outcomes, is to be in place by 1994.

Due to concerns over the economy, incentive programs in several states have received reduced or no funding. **Pennsylvania** school performance incentive program funding has been reduced from $4 million to $3 million. **Indiana** cut in half the money available for its school incentive program. **New York** has trimmed many add-on programs and no funding is currently provided for the fund for innovative schools. **Colorado** passed legislation in 1988 for its Excellent Schools Program to reward schools and personnel for performance, but has never provided state funding.

As with career ladder and teacher incentive programs, only a few comprehensive evaluations have been undertaken to look at effects of these school incentive programs. The **Pennsylvania** School Performance Incentive Program provides money for schools where reading and mathematics scores increased, or dropout rates decreased in grades 7 through 12, or where gains were made in the numbers and scores of students taking the SAT. In 1990, $630 per FTE teacher was distributed to schools. Personnel determined how funds were to be spent, but the funds could not be used to supplant other funding or to pay personnel. A study completed during the first two years of the program indicated that teachers and principals in

schools that did not receive awards were not familiar with it. Views were mixed about whether rewards should be used for improving instruction (Boe, April 1990).

The **Florida** Quality Incentives Program was discontinued in 1990. The legislature failed to pass a bill that would have mandated changes and did not fund the existing program. A new program was funded that provides awards to schools meeting particular indicators or goals. Several studies of the Quality Incentives Program had been completed; they recommended that the program's goals be clarified and that state standards be added to the district-designed programs. In a survey of attitudes toward the program, 79 percent of the principals and teachers believed the program had a positive impact and that it led to school improvement. Most district persons, however, believed the funding to be inadequate. In 1989, 585 schools shared $10 million—compared to 343 schools that shared $19.5 million in 1986. An earlier study by the Senate Education Committee noted difficulties with implementation. In one county, the plan allowed nearly all schools to be judged meritorious. The study also noted that districts did not have to adhere to statewide quality standards, and that some standards adopted by districts were questionable (MGT, January 1991). Reform legislation in 1991 created a total new accountability system for Florida, *Blueprint 2000*. As a part of the package, an incentive program based on outcomes of schools is to be developed.

Dilemmas for the '90s

School incentive programs that emphasize results for students are becoming more popular. States are increasingly linking both rewards and sanctions for schools or school districts to student achievement. Many states are giving districts relief from traditional state regulations. In the past year, states such as Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia have mandated that steps be taken to define what students need to know. These states are developing new assessments and reporting results through state report cards. Other states, including Alaska, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky, have similar reporting efforts underway.

Some career ladder and mentor teacher programs are helping teachers move into new roles and paying them for extra work. However, the notion of tying rewards for individual teachers to results of students is an area where few states have dared to tread. Arizona's plan has been the most direct in developing ways to link individual teacher performance and student achievement.

Lawmakers initially supported career ladders as a way to reward teachers who do the best teaching, but few programs have been developed to achieve that end. These programs may be worthwhile and important—but, are they what state policymakers envisioned or hoped for in the mid-1980s? On the positive side, there is evidence that career ladders have improved teaching in some settings, provided resources and encouragement for teachers to take on new roles, and helped teachers think about teaching in new ways. But, have these programs served as "incentives" to attract and retain the best teachers (a stated goal of most programs)? And, are they playing an integral role in achieving goals set by the nation, states, and districts?

The state role in making incentive programs work is critical. A recognized expert on school change, Michael Fullan, writes, "Schools cannot redesign themselves. . . .(the) role of the district is crucial." Teachers need motivation throughout their careers, Fullan says. He also speaks to the importance of states providing guidelines and support for programs to be developed (National Staff Development Council, December 1991/92). It is interesting to note that states which began with district-designed programs now often have a more centralized program with state guidelines. On the other hand, programs that were highly centralized or state-focused have become more flexible and involve teachers and principals more in changes.

In our 50-state survey of teacher and school incentive programs this year, only one state—Iowa—reports that a comprehensive third-party evaluation of its incentive program is underway. Iowa joins Arizona, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Utah as the only states that have funded comprehensive third-party evaluations. The results of the Iowa study will be available early in 1992.

Given the scarcity of in-depth, third-party evaluation, it is not surprising that researchers and state legislatures have not been able to compile the objective evidence needed to understand why teacher and school incentive programs do or don't work—and whether they have achieved the goals that lawmakers had in mind. Clearly, there is no single model for an effective incentive program. But state policymakers must clarify the program's purpose, involve teachers and principals in refining the programs,and constantly monitor and evaluate their impact.

Three rather simple questions arise out of the nation's experiment with incentive programs in the 1980s. Simple as they are, they may point to some of the problems states are likely to encounter as they move to accountability systems that focus more on student results.

1. Why do most school incentive programs choose to invest incentive monies in instructional programs rather than teachers' or principals' salaries?

2. Why do teachers prefer being paid for extra work, but not for doing a better job?

3. Why have few states seriously used student achievement in evaluating teacher performance? Why has it been resisted?

Some answers to these questions are technical, some are political, some social, and some relate to funding. Can incentive programs support and promote education systems that focus on student outcomes and provide the necessary climate to achieve the goals set by states and the nation for the next century?

Selected Resources

Arizona Department of Education. (1991, July). *Arizona Career Ladder Program Model Components: A Document Which Presents and Explains Major Aspects of the Arizona Career Ladder Law (Laws 1990, Chapter 319) through Narrative and Example.* Prepared by Linda L. Fuller, Ed.D., Program Director, Arizona Career Ladder Program.

Boe, Erling E. (1990, April 11). *The Entrepreneurial Restructuring of Pubic Education: School Incentives and the Merit School Component.* Report presented to the American Education Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

Cornett, Lynn M. (1988, August). "Teacher Incentives: The Outsiders' View--`Outsiders' Take a Look at Teacher Incentive Programs in Several States." Southern Regional Education Board Career Ladder Clearinghouse, Atlanta, Georgia.

Cornett, Lynn M. (1986, December). "1986--Incentive Programs for the Teacher and Administrators: How Are They Doing?" Southern Regional Education Board Career Ladder Clearinghouse, Atlanta, Georgia.

Cornett, Lynn M. & Gaines, Gale F. (1991, January). "Linking Performance to Rewards for Teachers, Principals, and Schools." Southern Regional Education Board Career Ladder Clearinghouse, Atlanta, Georgia.

Dickson, Louann. (1990, September 15). *Class Size in Mesa Public Schools: Research and Implementation.* Research and Evaluation prepared for the Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona.

Dickson, Louann. (1990). *Student Achievement and Career Ladder Status.* Research and Evaluation prepared for the Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona.

Firestone, William A. (1991, August). *Schools to Facilitate Professionals: Implications of the Organizational and Cognitive Research on Teaching.* Report presented for the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Rutgers Graduate School of Education.

Frase, Larry E. (1992). *Teacher Compensation and Motivation.* San Diego State University. Technomic Publishing Company, Inc. Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Fuller, Linda L. (1990, October 17). *Restructuring Educational Systems: Key Organizational Factors Affecting Teacher Development and Motivation.* A Summary of Dissertation Research Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Administration. Northern Arizona University.

Gallup Poll of Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. (1991, September). *Phi Delta Kappan*, Bloomington, Indiana.

Iowa Department of Education. (1991, June). *Iowa Educational Innovations*, Des Moines, Iowa.

Louisiana Department of Education. (1991, July). *Louisiana Model Career Options Program Guide*. Office of Research and Development, Bureau of Professional Accountability. Bulletin 1895.

MGT Consultants. (1991, January 25). *An Evaluation of Selected Components of the Raise and Reform Legislation--Final Report*. Report submitted to Assessment, Testing & Evaluation Section, Florida Department of Education. MGTof America, Tallahassee, Florida.

National Staff Development Council, *The Developer*. (December 1991/January 1992). "Understanding the Change Process: An Interview with Michael Fullan." By Dennis Sparks, Oxford, Ohio.

Nelson, David E. & Ross, John D. (1991, September). *A Follow-Up Statewide Survey of Teacher Opinions Concerning Utah's Career Ladder Program*. Utah State Office of Education.

Ohio Department of Education. (1990, December). *Ohio's Plan for Phasing In Career Ladder Programs*. Presented to the General Assembly. Columbus, Ohio.

Oklahoma City Public Schools. (1991, August 22). Performance Pay Package for Administrators; Teacher and Support Staff Incentive Package. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (press release).

Shulman, Judith & Colbert, Joel, eds. (1987, November). *The Mentor Teacher Casebook*. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. San Francisco, California and University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1991). *Teacher Evaluation Programs in SREB States*. Atlanta, Georgia.

Texas Education Agency. (1991, March). *Evaluation Study of The Texas Teacher Appraisal System*. Division of Program Evaluation. Austin, Texas.

INCENTIVE PROGRAMS — 1991

	Local Initiative	Pilots with State Funding and/or Assistance	Full Implementation of State Program	State Program Under Development	Discussion No Legislative Action Pending	Type of Program
Alabama						
Alaska	X				X	Teacher Incentive
Arizona			X			Career Ladder
Arkansas						
California			X			Mentor Teacher
Colorado		X(1)		X(2) (Not Funded)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Teacher/School Incentive
Connecticut			X(1)	X(2) (Not funded)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Career Development
Delaware						
Florida			X			School Incentive
Georgia				X (Not funded)		Career Ladder
Hawaii				X		Mentor Teacher
Idaho			X(1)	X(2)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Career Compensation
Illinois	X					Teacher Incentive
Indiana	X(1)		X(2) X(3)			(1) Career Ladder/ Development (2) Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Iowa			X			Teacher Incentive/ School Transformation
Kansas	X					Teacher Incentive
Kentucky				X		School Incentive
Louisiana		X(1)		X(2)		(1) Career Options (2) School Incentive
Maine			X			Tiered Certification
Maryland	X					Career Development Incentive
Massachusetts			X(1)	X(2)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Michigan	X					Teacher Incentive
Minnesota	X(1)	X(2)				(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Mississippi						
Missouri			X			Career Ladder
Montana	X(1)			X(2)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Nebraska						
Nevada	X					Teacher Incentive
New Hampshire	X					Teacher Incentive
New Jersey			X			Teacher Incentive
New Mexico					X	Teacher Incentive
New York	X(1)		X(2)			(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive
North Carolina			X			Career Ladder/ Differentiated Pay
North Dakota	X				X	Career Development
Ohio		X		X		Career Ladder
Oklahoma				X		Teacher Incentive
Oregon		X(1)	X(2)			(1) Career Development (2) Mentor Teacher
Pennsylvania			X(1) X(2) X(3)			(1) Career Development (2) Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Rhode Island					X	Mentor Teacher
South Carolina			X(1)	X(2)		(1) School Incentive (2) Campus Incentive
South Dakota	X			X		Mentor Teacher
Tennessee			X			Career Ladder
Texas			X(1) X(2)			(1) Career Ladder (2) School Incentive
Utah			X			Career Ladder
Vermont						
Virginia		X(2)		X(1)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive
Washington		X(1)	X(2)			(1) School Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
West Virginia			X			Mentor Teacher
Wisconsin	X(1)(2)				X(1)	(1)Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive
Wyoming	X					Teacher Incentive

Southern Regional Education Board

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SURVEY OF STATE ACTIONS

Alabama

The Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Program, established in 1985 legislation called for two phases. Plagued with controversy during Phase I--development and implementation of the evaluation system--and with a tight state fiscal situation, the legislature repealed the program in March of 1988, thus discontinuing the process for statewide evaluation procedures. The career ladder part of the plan, Phase II, was never implemented.

Following the repeal of this law, the Alabama State Board of Education adopted a resolution requiring each local board of education to develop an evaluation system for all professional educational personnel. The locally developed evaluation system must be based upon research-based criteria established by the State Board of Education. A task force has identified competencies and indicators to be used in evaluating teachers and administrators. Personnel in specialty areas, such as counselors, speech pathologists, and library media specialists, have been included. Procedures, to be used by districts in developing and implementing local systems based on the competencies, have been completed. The State Department of Education will provide assistance to local districts, and will develop a criteria-based evaluation system for districts that do not undertake their own projects. Until the newly developed system is in place, each local board of education is required to continue its current evaluation system. In the Auburn City Schools an evaluation system has been developed that includes structured interviews, classroom evaluations, and a professional development plan. At particular intervals during a teacher's career, meeting performance levels are necessary to move to higher salary steps on the salary schedule.

During the 1991 legislative session, the Alabama Improvement Act was passed. The Act requires the Alabama State Board of Education to implement evaluation of all professional education personnel and encourages local districts to develop site-based decision-making programs.

Presently, the education budget has been cut, which has created a funding problem statewide. Consequently, the focus for the 1991-92 school year has been changed from training evaluators to conducting the evaluations of administrators to development of data collection instruments, policies and procedures for teachers, and specialty areas. Training will resume in October, 1992.

Alaska

In Alaska, local school districts are authorized to establish career ladder programs for their teachers. Local career ladders are normally based on educational credits, degrees, and longevity.

The Alaska legislature and the State Board of Education initiated several programs to involve teachers in shaping educational programs. Legislation passed in 1990 requires

schools and school districts to report on their performance to the public. In 1991, the State Board of Education adopted the Alaska 2000 Education Initiative that includes the idea of promoting and rewarding improved teaching practices.

Annually, the State Department of Education sponsors training programs for teachers to improve their teaching skills. These include summer staff development academies, mathematics and writing consortia, healthy life skills curricula development, suicide prevention programs, and training for working with at-risk students. Additionally, the department is continuing federally funded teacher incentive grants for developing classroom projects that have potential for use by other teachers.

Arkansas

Legislation passed in 1991, "Meeting the National Education Goals: Schools for Arkansas' Future," provides for the development of a 10-year plan for restructuring the education system. Emphasis is on integrating statewide curriculum frameworks, performance assessment tools, and professional development programs. The legislation calls for the State Board of Education to adopt learner outcomes and to set up a task force to design and implement a licensure system for teachers and administrators based on outcomes. A newly established Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management for local board members, administrators, and teachers will provide educators in every school with the training and tools to determine the best way to achieve the goals. The legislation also provides $20,000 grants for planning and/or professional development activities for schools and districts involved in the restructuring process. So that parents and the general public will be informed of progress, a new student performance assessment program is being developed and results will be incorporated into school report cards. A 1989 law established a report card system and the second annual report has been released.

Arkansas' Restructuring Schools for Higher Order Learning Project, in its fourth year, involves 79 schools statewide in 44 school districts.

Another measure to put school restructuring into practice was the approval for funding to implement the 1989 law creating a magnet school in rural Arkansas. The school will draw, on a voluntary basis, students from several school districts. The school will be a laboratory for studying and disseminating information on the most current strategies to improve rural education.

Arizona

Legislation passed from 1984 through 1988 in Arizona established a five-year career ladder pilot program and authorized a Joint Legislative Committee to be involved with the approval and monitoring of pilot districts. The locally designed pilot programs were developed in consultation with teachers. Criteria for the projects included procedures that stressed assessment of teacher performance, a compensation system based completely on a restructured salary schedule rather than merit raises on top of a base salary schedule,

evidence of teacher support, and a way to evaluate student achievement. Fourteen districts have taken part since 1985. In 1988-89, funding for the program was $13.8 million. The cost for 1989-90 was $18.4 million, 1990-91 was $20.2 million, and the estimate for 1991-92 is $21.1 million. Funds are provided through a formula based on student count and projected annual percentage increases during the first few years of the program to cover higher participation rates and the increased cost of teachers moving up the ladder.

As a result of gains in student achievement within the pilot districts, the legislature passed a law in 1990 to expand the program. This statewide project will add seven new districts over four years beginning in 1992-93. Currently, an application form is being drafted that will allow the original 14 districts to apply for a three-year waiver from annual reapproval requirements. As required by the law, oversight has shifted from the legislature to the State Board of Education, and a statewide advisory committee consisting of legislators, personnel from the original pilot districts, and community members has been formed. Based on findings from the pilot project, program requirements for new districts will contain additions to the pilot guidelines--all teachers new to a district will be required to participate, differentiated evaluation criteria will be developed for various levels of the ladder, multiple evaluators will be used, and teachers reaching the top rungs of the ladder will be required to take on additional instructional responsibilities. In addition, district readiness to implement a career ladder program will be considered in the approval process. The new guidelines are not required for the original pilot districts; however, incentives will be available for those districts that incorporate the new ideas. Of the 14 original districts, 13 have applied for the incentives; one district has met all of the new guidelines and has been granted increased funding for 1991-92. It is anticipated that several additional districts will receive approval for 1992-93.

California

The California Mentor Teacher Program, created in 1983, is intended to upgrade the skills of experienced as well as new teachers. The retention of exemplary teachers is encouraged through the selection of "mentor teachers," who are designated to spend part of their time working with new and experienced teachers. The program provides incentives to the mentors, who are selected by committees composed mainly of teachers, to encourage them to remain in the classroom. Participating teachers work together on common instructional issues and assist one another in promoting student learning and school improvement, and in raising the status of the teaching profession.

The program has grown steadily in its eight years. Currently over 10,000 mentors work in a variety of professional development roles with more than 16,000 new teachers. Funding for 1991-92 (estimated at $65 million) will provide each mentor with a stipend of $4,312. Additionally, districts receive $2,156 per mentor to offset the costs of selection and training, and to provide release time so that the mentor can work with other teachers.

The legislation that established the program allows districts broad latitude in designing, implementing, and evaluating their individual mentor programs. Districts are planning the future direction of their mentor programs as part of a larger strategy for building teacher leadership and responsibility, and for supporting curriculum improvement and staff training.

Colorado

As a part of Colorado's Educational Quality Act of 1985, 20 pilot projects were given support to research and test the value of innovative teaching programs. The projects addressed such issues as career ladders, mentor teacher programs, career enrichment, and performance incentives. The Department of Education's final report on the program in August 1987 concluded that a statewide approach to the issue of incentives was not feasible. It recommended that the state should coordinate the development of guidelines that would allow for local district teacher recognition and compensation programs.

During the 1988 session, legislation passed that allowed local districts to design and implement pilot alternative salary policies. The Department of Education is responsible for reviewing pilot proposals submitted by the districts and providing assistance to districts implementing programs. No state funds have been provided for this purpose--districts participating must finance the alternative salary policies from existing operating funds. One district has submitted a proposal; funding depends on the outcome of a millage increase election.

Another program established by the 1988 legislature is the Excellent Schools Program, the purpose of which is to provide financial awards to personnel, schools, and districts that demonstrate outstanding performance in achieving established goals. No state funds were appropriated for the program; however, the Department of Education was authorized to receive contributions to fund the financial awards. The State Board of Education has adopted standards for the awards and contributions can now be accepted.

Legislation in 1990 created the Teacher Employment and Compensation Committee to study employment and compensation issues, particularly the relationship of performance to compensation. The committee's report, presented in December 1990, recommended $200,000 in funding for school incentives, urged the Department of Education to promote and assist in the development of district career ladder systems, called for the creation of a special study committee to focus on the issue of merit or performance-based pay plans, and endorsed the concept of "tiered licensing" where the various types of licenses have different expected skill levels.

Connecticut

In January 1987, the governor of Connecticut signed into law legislation that addressed increases in minimum salaries for teachers (to $20,000), professional development, teacher evaluation, and teacher career incentives programs. Under this law, the Connecticut Department of Education provided grants to assist local and regional boards of education and regional educational service centers in developing new or revising existing teacher evaluation programs. Grants were also provided to plan teacher career incentive programs. The development of career incentive programs could include compensation related to factors other than seniority and academic degree; the naming of mentor and cooperating teachers; a career advancement ladder; and the consideration of performance, experience, job-related education, and advanced academic training.

The teacher evaluation and the career incentives development programs each received $1 million in state funding for planning grants to be made either in 1987-88 or 1988-89. (Districts could apply for funds in one year or the other but not both.) Additionally, $3 million was provided to implement teacher evaluation programs in 1988-89. Due to fiscal constraints, the legislature did not fund the Department of Education's request for $3 million in teacher evaluation implementation funds in 1989-90. However, $1 million was provided for professional development grants--districts continuing their programs did so through this grant program and local funding.

The Connecticut General Assembly passed legislation in 1990 that required each local school district to create a three-year Comprehensive Professional Development Plan by April 1,1991. The purpose of the plan is to provide the ongoing mechanism for each board to identify and address the professional development and teacher evaluation needs of its professional staff. Guidelines--13 for professional development and 19 for teacher evaluation--have been adopted by the State Board of Education to assist districts in developing comprehensive plans. Due to continuing fiscal constraints, the $1 million that was proposed to fund district Comprehensive Development Plans in 1991-92 was not passed by the legislature.

The Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) program is in its third year after three years of development and field-testing. About 1,000 beginning teachers, who are paired with trained mentor teachers, will be evaluated six times during this year. While $8 million was provided for the program in 1990-91 and $11 million was requested for 1991-92, only $3 million was appropriated by the legislature due to the state's economic conditions.

Delaware

Early efforts in Delaware focused on career ladder and other incentive programs. Funds were appropriated in 1985 for the development and implementation of a career ladder program. When agreement on a program could not be reached, the funds were used to develop teacher training models and to implement a statewide appraisal system. The focus then turned to professional development for teachers and principals. Teachers are trained in the elements of effective teaching; principals, in supervision and evaluation fundamentals and in the elements of effective schools. A statewide policy for appraising school-level administrators was adopted by the State Board of Education in July 1990.

Florida

Florida's High School Accountability Program was created in 1989 to reward schools that increase graduation rates, lower dropout rates, and reduce the number of graduates who are placed in remedial programs in postsecondary education institutions. Schools set goals, establish indicators to mark progress, and receive money for meeting them. The funds are to be used by the school "to improve productivity, including improvement of student outcomes." Schools are challenged to form partnerships with the community, business leaders, and parents to meet the student outcome indicators. In 1989-90, $1.8 million was awarded in

grants of $10,000 to $75,000 based on the number of indicators met by the schools; 68 high schools in 17 districts participated (240 schools applied). In 1990-91, 258 schools from 53 districts applied for awards.

The 1990 session in Florida brought changes to incentive programs for schools. The five-year-old District Quality Instruction Incentives Program (Merit Schools Program), in which districts designed programs to reward school employees or improve instruction, was discontinued. The program, funded at $10 million for several years, was evaluated by an outside review team. Around 80 percent of principals and teachers in participating districts believed that incentive awards to meritorious schools had a positive impact, however, the funding was considered inadequate. The recommendations were to continue the program with more focused criteria and more program evaluation. Legislation for changes was not passed nor was funding continued.

Additional incentive programs for teachers and administrators include a Teacher of the Year Program, with the Teacher of the Year receiving $2,500 from state funds and $10,000 from Burdines, a corporate sponsor of the program. Local and regional winners were awarded $500 from the state and $750 from Burdines.

The Florida Commissioner of Education also created the Principal Achievement Awards. Principals are chosen on the basis of several criteria of excellence, such as increasing student performance; encouraging positive, innovative teaching; utilizing community resources; and creating positive school climates. The 1990-91 awards went to 15 principals, three from each of Florida's five regions. There are no funds associated with these awards but the Commissioner of Education has approved the establishment of a Principal's Hall of Fame in the Florida Education Center.

School districts and schools within the districts are participating in still another effort--School Improvement Programs. These are partnerships in which State Department of Education personnel work with district persons, including school board members, to: develop school improvement plans to reach one of four goals that include getting children ready for school, increasing graduation rates, improving the quality of staff, and increasing student achievement. Schools (52 in 17 districts) received $10 per FTE in 1990-91, with awards ranging from $4,000 to $12,000 per school.

At the district level, the 1991 contract between the Dade County Public Schools and the United Teachers of Dade continues many initiatives implemented in the landmark agreement of 1988. The 1991 contract continues the trend begun in 1974 to move toward school-based management and shared decision-making (SBM/SDM) at the school level. The Professionalization of Teaching Task Force remains an important joint union/administration vehicle for addressing SBM/SDM issues. Examples of the application of school-based management and shared decision-making contained in this contract are provisions for expanded participation of parents and students in the decision-making process, the implementation of an alternative supplement model for the 1992-93 school year, and the development of a pilot Peer Intervention and Assistance Program (PIAP). During the 1991-92 school year, 151 schools are participating in the initiative. The teachers' union and the School

Board have agreed to waive district rules or contract provisions, if necessary, with the current labor contract containing over 150 such waivers.

Georgia

The Georgia Career Ladder Program, developed in response to 1985 legislation, was piloted in five systems during the 1988-89 school year. Funding for implementation in approximately 32 school systems was sought from the 1990 General Assembly. No funds were appropriated. Subsequent shortfalls of revenues have precluded any implementation of a career ladder or pay-for-performance plan. In 1991, the governor established a Task Force on Teacher Pay for Performance. That group has developed a plan that would provide bonuses for all teachers in a school for schoolwide improvement. Schools would set goals, a state panel would approve plans and money could be paid to teachers, be spent for instruction, or for equipment. The school faculty would decide how money would be spent. Funding is not expected to be available until 1993-94.

A recently released report by a University System of Georgia Review Committee on Teacher Preparation calls for an outcome-based approach to teacher preparation and licensing, with development of new and improved assessments of knowledge and skills of teachers. The recommendations urge that teachers be viewed in changing roles--mentor, coach, tutor, and less a lecturer. It also calls for teachers to be part of assessment teams and to work with arts and sciences and education faculty at clinical development sites for teacher training.

Hawaii

A number of programs implemented in Hawaii have offered incentives for teachers and school administrators. The alternative certification program, originally limited to mathematics and science, has been extended to address teacher shortages in counseling, special education, and school library services. This program allows current teachers as well as persons with undergraduate degrees in the shortage areas to seek certification in those areas.

The State Department of Education is submitting a legislative budget request to initiate a statewide program based on mentor teacher programs in several districts. As a measure to support and retain new teachers, the Department will request about $1.3 million for support personnel and training for beginning teachers. A $1 million proposal to support the establishment of professional development schools to simultaneously strengthen pre-service teacher education programs and school renewal is also part of the budget request. The initiative was implemented beginning September 1991, using exiting resources.

Other initiatives that encourage professional growth include staff development programs for teachers and administrators, which are funded at nearly $2.5 million. The appropriated funds are prorated to districts based upon teacher units; individual schools then submit development plans to the districts for funding. An education-business partnership effort places teachers and school administrators in four-week to six-week summer internships at

local businesses where they can acquire new job perspectives and skills in planning, staff development, and community relations. The interns are paid $1,500 by the businesses for their participation. In June 1990, a federally funded summer internship program was implemented. School administrators and teachers are assigned to state and district offices for six weeks to receive work experience in such areas as curriculum and instructional services, personnel services, business services, planning, and public relations. Participants are paid $2,000.

A new school administration training program, the Cohort School Leadership Program, was implemented in September 1990. Forty teachers were placed in a one-year, on-the-job school administration intern program. Course credit requirements were completed during the internship and participants were given the opportunity to earn a master's degree in Educational Administration. The program emphasizes field-based learning and uses a case or clinical studies approach. A second group of 40 teachers began the program in September 1991.

A business-education partnership effort has resulted in the establishment of the Hawaii School Recognition Program. Frito-Lay of Hawaii provides cash awards to honor schools that have demonstrated outstanding performance in achieving established goals. Secondary schools were recognized in 1990; elementary schools were recognized in 1991.

Idaho

Idaho enacted legislation in 1984 that permitted school districts to participate in the Teacher Excellence Program; $100,000 was appropriated for administration and assistance to local districts in developing career compensation plans in the 1985 fiscal year, with the expectation that these plans would be implemented during the following year. While the 1985 legislature did not appropriate the funding for local career compensation plans due to economic considerations, $90,000 was provided to the State Department of Education to continue a local district assistance program, with a verbal commitment to address the career ladder issue in upcoming legislative sessions.

The 1989 legislature did address the issue by appropriating a one-time $3 million for programs that attract and retain quality teachers. The funds were to be used to support a minimum teacher salary of $16,000, to implement career compensation plans developed as a result of the 1985 funding, and for the development and implementation of compensation plans in those districts that do not currently have such plans. Because the salaries of so many teachers fell below the $16,000 minimum, the funding was used to raise salaries. Approximately 25 of the state's 113 school districts developed career compensation plans after the legislature's actions in 1985; however, no other districts have submitted plans to the Department of Education for approval.

Funding for the educator mentor program continues to be provided. Districts receive $1,000 for each first-year certified person employed.

Illinois

The Illinois Education Reform Act of 1986 authorized the establishment of a Center for Excellence in Teaching within the State Board of Education to conduct a study of teacher career compensation programs based on merit. The State Board of Education was authorized to fund five to seven pilot programs in local districts; $1 million was allocated for the implementation phase during 1986-87.

The pilot programs were designed to identify, from an array of various types, compensation programs that the General Assembly might then extend on a statewide basis. Proposals were solicited from all Illinois school districts; 30 proposals were received, all of which were developed by the school districts in conjunction with their teachers and a participating university. In March 1986, seven districts, representing a diverse collection of sizes and types and with programs offering a variety of approaches to the compensation issue, were awarded grants to continue developing plans for implementation. Funding for the pilots was scaled down in 1987-88--$800,000 supported the continuation of five of the pilots. The same five continued during 1988-89 with $600,000. No further funding has been provided.

Indiana

A plan was developed in response to 1985 legislation requiring the Indiana State Department of Education to determine the feasibility of a career ladder plan and to develop methods to honor, recognize, and provide professional growth for teachers. The four-year Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement Program, completed in 1990, involved pilot projects primarily in career ladder and career development areas. Of the 181 pilot projects, 158 were funded under career development, 9 under career ladder, and 14 in other areas. Following the pilot projects, the Department concluded that local districts should be encouraged to develop and implement career ladder and career development programs based upon their individual needs. No direct state support is available, but some of the pilot projects have continued with local district support.

Beginning in 1988-89, all districts were required to have a mentor teacher program, in which new teachers participate as a condition for continued employment. Again, $2 million was appropriated to support the program. From these funds, mentor teachers are paid $600 per year and the districts receive $200 per mentor to provide release time.

Indiana has initiated a school incentive program authorized by the legislature in 1987. Schools receive cash awards for student improvement in at least two of four areas (performance on the state progress exam, language arts test scores, mathematics scores, and attendance rates). The 1988-89 appropriation of $10 million was distributed in the 1989-90 school year. The second $10 million appropriation was distributed in 1990-91. Current funding has been reduced to $4.9 million due to the economy. The State Board of Education is proposing that schools with traditionally high levels of success be eligible for awards for continuing that level of success.

Iowa

Legislation enacted in 1987 established Iowa's Educational Excellence Program, which consists of three major phases that address recruiting quality teachers; retaining quality teachers; and improving the quality, effectiveness, and performance of teachers. The Educational Excellence Program is currently funded at $92.9 million.

Phase I, which is funded at $11 million, establishes a minimum teacher salary of $18,000 for all full-time teachers. Phase II, with $40 million in funding, improves salaries of experienced teachers. Phase III promotes excellence through the development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans based on additional work assignments or specialized training. In 1989-90, teachers participating in Phase III received average increases of $1,231 in supplemental or performance-based pay. A 1990 amendment to the Phase III program allows districts and Area Education Agencies (AEAs) to provide salary increases for teachers who work to restructure schools (comprehensive school transformation). Phase III is funded at $41 million.

To receive the Phase III allocation, school districts and AEAs annually develop plans based on identified needs and goals. Each year, expenditures and progress made toward goals are reported. The most common goals in 1989-90 were to develop curriculum, provide staff development for teachers, and provide students with additional educational opportunities.

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) has been named by the Iowa legislature to conduct an independent evaluation of Phase III. On-site visits to selected school districts and AEAs occurred in the spring of 1991. Teams included Iowa teachers currently participating in Phase III. The evaluation report will be presented to the Iowa Legislature in January 1992.

Kansas

The Kansas State Board of Education and the legislature have adopted the position that teacher incentive programs should be developed and funded at the local level. A pilot internship program designed to improve the quality of teachers entering the profession was funded at $225,000 in 1988. No state funding has been provided since 1988-89.

Kentucky

Comprehensive legislation passed by the 1990 Kentucky General Assembly calls for measurable goals for schools that "define the outcomes expected of students." The intent of the law is that "schools succeed with all students" and provide rewards for schools that show improvement over a two-year period. Improving achievement, developing skills in communications and mathematics, being able to make a successful transition to work, reducing dropout rates, and becoming problem solvers are among outcomes for students. The State Board of Education is setting standards for schools, taking into account the proportion of students who are already successful in the school. Measurable outcomes for

goals and assessments that will include performance outcomes for students have been developed. Baseline assessments will be established in 1992. Rewards will go to each individual school when gains are made. It is expected that the first awards will be made in 1994. School staff will decide how the reward funds will be spent, but bonuses will not be added to base salary. Schools that do not reach threshold levels of performance will be required to develop school improvement plans and, ultimately, staff can be declared "in crisis" and placed on probation. Parents can choose to transfer students to successful schools.

The legislation also called for Kentucky "Distinguished Educators" to be chosen to assist the State Department of Education with projects and work with schools in crisis. When assigned to work with unsuccessful schools, the educators will receive a salary supplement of 50 percent of their annual salary. The Kentucky Professional Compensation Plan is to be developed and implemented in 1992-93. The plan is to have advancement opportunities based on professional skills with consideration of education, rank, years of service, length of work year, and performance. The law also calls for school-based decision making. Every district has at least one school with school-based decision making by this 1991-92 school year; all schools must have school-site management in place by 1996.

Louisiana

Louisiana's 1988 legislation, the "Children First" education reform package, called for two incentive programs--the School Profile and Incentive Program and the Model Career Options package. Data collection for the School Progress Profiles began with the 1989-90 school year, and the second profile reports for each school and district have been issued. The School Incentive Program is under development. The Model Career Options Program is being piloted for two years and will be implemented in the 1991-92 school year.

These programs are part of a package that raised teacher salaries, extended the state salary schedule to include 25 years of experience, and established evaluation procedures for the performance of teachers as a part of continuing certification.

The School Profile and Incentive Program (funded at $2.1 million in 1990-91) called for the creation of profiles of schools. The profiles, approved by the Board of Education, will be prepared annually on every school and school system. The school reports are prepared for parents and the public and include information on test results, class size, faculty qualifications, student dropouts, attendance, and suspensions.

The School Incentive Program (funded at $150,000 in 1991-92 for the third year of development) is designed to reward schools making significant progress and to increase local accountability. The pilot phase continues in 1991-92 to test the standards for selecting award recipients. Some 50 schools received cash awards, with another 300 schools receiving flags and certificates. (Schools are grouped into similar categories based on such factors as sociceconomic status of students, size of school, and urban or suburban location.) The cash awards will be used for instruction, not to increase salaries. School councils of teachers, community members, and students will assist the principals in determining use of the award.

The Model Career Options program provides teachers with salary bonuses for performance and advancement and opportunities to take on new and expanded responsibilities, as well as providing districts with additional services using talented teachers. A statewide committee developed the program. As of fall 1991, 512 eligible teachers have participated in the program. The average additional pay is $2,620. Teachers also receive $300 to cover program-related expenses such as supplies and travel to meetings. For the 1991-92 school year, each teacher will receive 11.73 percent of the teacher's minimum state salary as a bonus. The program is voluntary for teachers who have seven years of experience, at least a master's degree, and a superior rating on the statewide evaluation system. The program has three options. Teachers can work with other teachers as a mentor (working with new teachers), or as peer consultants. In a second option, teachers can choose to provide supplemental enrichment or remediation instructional programs for students. A third choice is to work with school faculty at one or more schools or at the district level in staff development or curriculum development. Teachers develop action plans in consultation with their principal or central office staff for participation. A third party evaluation of the program is underway.

Maine

As a result of legislation adopted in 1984, a certification pilot study was conducted by 20 school districts in Maine from April 1984 through December 1986. The law established three levels of certification--a two-year provisional certificate for beginning teachers, a renewable five-year professional certificate, and a master teacher certificate. Under the law, beginning teachers serving the two-year provisional term were supervised and evaluated by support systems consisting primarily of teachers; evaluation criteria included professional classroom skills and subject matter knowledge. After successfully completing the provisional term, the teachers were granted the professional certificate.

The State Board of Education adopted procedures for the statewide implementation of the certification program, standards for the support systems, and a process for appeals pertaining to applications for the issuance and renewal of certificates. The certification program took effect on July 1, 1988. All districts now have support systems that are providing the State Department of Education with recommendations for certification renewals.

All professional level certificate holders have the opportunity to apply for a master level certificate based on a locally developed process. Currently, there are about 160 master teachers statewide (out of a total of 12,000 teachers). Local districts determine the level of additional pay, if any, for master teachers.

Due to economic conditions, some certification requirements have been temporarily relaxed. Districts now have the option to assign a single mentor to beginning teachers rather than a support team. Additionally, to ease the workload of the district support systems, the State Department of Education will renew certificates *without* their recommendations.

Maryland

Incentive programs continue to be based primarily at the local level. However, in keeping with the major goals adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education in 1991 for its Schools for Success initiative, the State Department of Education has been planning to improve the quality of beginning teachers by moving toward the inclusion of performance assessment criteria in teacher preparation programs leading to initial certification. The criteria themselves will be tied to a validated core of Essential Teaching Knowledge expressed as outcomes. Appropriate models of performance assessment will be developed through collaboration with higher education as well as research on outcomes-based models for teacher performance.

The State Board of Education is also investigating the connection that should exist between recertification and evidence of lifelong learning and continuous professional growth. Several ideas are being considered by the Board for possible inclusion in a new policy. These include acknowledging experienced teachers' contributions to the profession as monitors, cooperating teachers, researchers, developers, and writers by crediting these services toward re-licensing. Another idea being considered is the creation of a meritorious title or license for teachers who exemplify the highest standards of performance and professionalism.

The Maryland School Performance Program is being implemented over several years. The second year of report cards have just been issued, with data available for the first time on a school-by-school basis. Data include assessed knowledge, student attendance, and yearly dropout and promotion rates. Supporting information, such as student population characteristics, is also provided. Ratings of excellent, satisfactory, or standard-not-yet-met are noted for each category.

Massachusetts

The Public School Improvement Act of 1985 established a far-reaching program of educational reform in Massachusetts that included several types of teacher incentive programs. The act called for a minimum teacher's salary of $18,000 and state funding to pay for some of the educational expenses of those who agree to teach within the state after their graduation. The legislation also established the "Horace Mann Teacher" designation and the Lucretia Crocker Exemplary Fellowship Program. Under the former, the Board of Education developed guidelines for establishing programs with expanded duties for teachers, including responsibilities for training teachers, developing curricula, providing special assistance to potential dropouts, and serving as in-service instructors or consultants. Subject to collective bargaining, school committees designate the Horace Mann teachers on the basis of criteria supplied by the State Board of Education. In FY92, there was no appropriation of funds for the Horace Mann program.

The Lucretia Crocker program was created to award teacher fellowships to disseminate information about exemplary educational programs that have been successful in advancing academic and creative achievement and creating a better school climate. In 1990-

91, 15 fellows were supported with an appropriation of $487,000. In FY92 the appropriation was reduced to $150,000; three Lucretia Crocker fellowships were awarded.

Following recommendations made by the Joint Task Force on Teacher Preparation, the State Department of Education is in the process of revising certification requirements to encompass a two-stage program leading to full certification. The first stage will involve completing a bachelor's degree in liberal arts to receive a provisional certificate. The second stage will include the completion of a clinical master's degree and two years of employment under the guidance of a mentor teacher. In January 1990, the State Board of Education approved regulations to implement these requirements, which are to become effective October 1, 1994.

Michigan

Legislation passed in Michigan in 1990 requires all public schools to develop and adopt three-year to five-year school improvement plans that could include teacher incentives. Schools are also required to report to the public annually on the status of the school, adopt a core curriculum as a means of raising academic standards and improving school accountability, and become accredited by the State Board of Education. To support this effort in 1991-92, $2.4 million has been appropriated. Additionally, $25 per pupil is available through the finance formula for extra assistance to less wealthy districts implementing the requirements of the law.

Funds totaling $2 million are available for the second year of pilot projects designed to improve outcomes for *all* students through restructuring the organization, roles, and relationships of the school. In 1989-90, 41 pilot projects were funded with $2 million.

Minnesota

A Minnesota law passed in 1987 created a teacher mentoring task force to make recommendations for a system of state and local incentives for a mentor teacher competitive grant program. For the 1987-88 biennium, $500,000 was appropriated for mentor teacher grants; 11 grants were awarded. For the 1989-91 biennium, $500,000 was again provided to continue the pilots, disseminate materials from these pilots, and provide training to other interested districts.

With the pilots now concluded, the legislature appropriated $700,000 for the 1992-93 biennium for competitive grants to schools and districts implementing or expanding mentor teacher programs.

Mississippi

Legislation passed in Mississippi in 1991 called for a statewide Mentor Teacher Program for first-year teachers. The project is underway as a joint effort of the State

Department of Education and a university in the state to develop and pilot a program. It is to be fully implemented by 1994, depending on availability of funding.

All teachers must go through a state board evaluation process at least once and meet proficiency standards to receive pay raises. In addition, all teachers are evaluated annually by local districts. The state trains and certifies persons to serve as evaluators in these systems. Districts use either the state-developed model or the state competencies and guidelines for development for local plans. Incentive programs that were included in 1990 legislation have not been implemented because funding was not available.

Missouri

In April 1986, the Missouri State Board of Education approved a career ladder model and guidelines for the development of individual district plans. The model was developed by an advisory committee appointed by the State Board as a result of a 1985 education reform act. The model consists of three stages, each of which contains a set of predetermined criteria. Both district and teacher participation is voluntary; however, should a district decide to participate, it must guarantee local funds to supplement an allocation made by the state in reaching the state-specified salary supplement levels: $1,500--Stage I; $3,000--Stage II; $5,000--Stage III. District plans must conform to the state model and guidelines.

Funding and participation has steadily increased since the program began. In 1986-87, 2,369 teachers, librarians, and counselors in 63 school districts qualified to reach Stage I. The state provided $2.6 million to support the first year of implementation. for 1987-88, $7.3 million was appropriated and about 5,000 participants in 120 school districts received salary supplements. About 6,000 participants in 150 districts were eligible to receive supplements in 1988-89, with state funding of $11.4 million. In 1989-90, 7,000 teachers, counselors, and librarians from 177 districts participated in the career ladder program at a cost to the state of $13 million. During 1990-91, 8,000 educators from 197 districts took part in the program; state funding increased to $17.5 million.

Due to current economic difficulties, many of the programs included in the 1985 reform legislation have not been funded. However, the Career Ladder Program is one of the few that has not experienced a reduction in funding. The program is expected to continue growing during 1991-92, with approximately 8,200 teachers in 206 districts participating. Funding is expected to exceed $18 million.

Montana

During 1985-86, Montana implemented an experimental program to identify teachers with the potential of becoming principals and to assist these teachers in completing certification requirements. The selected teachers may act in the capacity of principal under supervision for a period of up to three years while working toward certification. A similar program was initiated in 1987-88 for those certified teachers seeking endorsement for special education. While completing the requirements, a person may teach in special education

under supervision for up to one year. In 1988-89, a program for teachers interested in becoming guidance counselors was introduced.

The 1991 legislature enacted legislation that creates a research fund for the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council. One-half of all certification fees ($15 per certificate) will be placed in this fund, which should accumulate $78,000 per year. During the next four years, the Council will be using a portion of this fund to implement a pilot mentorship (beginning teacher support) program in 15 locations across the state. The program is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1992.

Nebraska

Provisions for a career ladder were enacted by the Nebraska legislature in 1984 as part of the governor's omnibus education improvement bill. The legislature postponed the implementation date twice. In 1987 legislation, the implementation date was removed from law and a provision was added that made initiation of the program dependent upon funding. Funding has not been provided to the State Department of Education for development and implementation of the program. The statute relating to the career ladder was repealed by the 1990 legislature.

Nevada

Nevada's Committee on School Improvement Through Incentives, in an April 1985 report directed to legislators and state and local education agency personnel, recommended that local districts in Nevada be encouraged to develop various kinds of incentive programs with state funding. However, no legislation has been enacted; no funding has been provided; and there are no plans for a statewide initiative. Local districts, however, are initiating various incentive programs.

New Hampshire

The New Hampshire educational system is decentralized and is financed primarily with local funds. The State Board of Education has encouraged local districts to adopt compensation and incentive plans for teachers; however, any action taken is strictly a matter of local option. Currently, a few districts are experimenting with some form of incentive program. The State Board of Education is continuing to monitor their efforts.

New Jersey

A number of initiatives to improve the teaching profession continue in New Jersey, though funding has been reduced or eliminated due to economic restraints. Currently, all teachers are guaranteed a minimum salary of $18,500. A teacher recognition program, known as the Governor's Convocation on Excellence in Teaching, involves an annual public ceremony for one outstanding teacher from each public school. Previously, grants of $500

were provided to each teacher's district to be expended as designated by the teacher. Funding was not continued this year.

The Governor's Teaching Scholars Program, designed to attract 100 talented high school students annually to teaching, provides up to $30,000 in scholarship loans, which may be redeemed by teaching four years in an urban school or six years in a non-urban school. While previously awarded scholarship loans continue, no funding was provided to offer new awards to entering freshmen.

Other continuing efforts include the Commissioner's Symposium for Outstanding Teachers (100 teachers are selected to attend a three-day summer retreat to exchange ideas with other state educators), the Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Management (trains teams of teachers and principals in proven techniques of instruction and instructional supervision), and the Minority Teacher Program (aimed toward attracting promising minority high school students into the teaching profession).

New Mexico

In 1985, the New Mexico legislature requested continued study of performance-based pay systems, but declining state revenues continue to deter efforts to initiate incentive programs.

New York

The legislature of New York has continued to fund, in most cases at reduced levels, several programs designed to strengthen the teaching profession. In 1991-92, an appropriation of about $57 million (down from $160 million) will provide teachers with salary increases based on their length of service. The Teacher Opportunity Corps, funded at nearly $1.5 million (down from $1.7 million) in its fifth year of operation, attracts potential teachers into working with "at risk" students. Additionally, the Empire State Challenger Scholarship and Fellowship programs for students preparing to teach in shortage areas are again funded at $4 million. Programs not receiving funding include the Teacher Summer Business Employment program, which provided incentives to private employers for hiring teachers during the summer, and the Fund for Innovation, which assisted school boards and teachers in implementing agreements on decision making, problem resolution, and new organizational structures.

Two other programs were not funded by the legislature due to the severe economic conditions in the state. The sixth year of the Mentor Teacher-Internship program which was due to be fully implemented in 1993, received no funding. Nor did the teacher resource and computer training centers that assist teachers in increasing their ability to meet the educational needs of their students. While many districts will continue these programs with local funds and with help from business and industry, the State Board of Education is seeking state funds from the 1992 legislature to continue these programs.

In Rochester, the Career in Teaching (CIT) Program is being implemented. A 1988 career options agreement between the Rochester City School District and the Rochester Teachers' Association enables teachers to remain in the classroom and to assume different duties for part of the day. The contract also increased salaries, added days to the school year for teachers, moved away from a pay scale based solely on years of experience and degrees, and included school-based planning committees. The CIT program involves four career levels and incorporates the district's Peer Assistance and Review Program (first implemented in 1986) that provides internships for new teachers and intervention to tenured teachers who need assistance. It is overseen by a joint panel of 12 members--six appointed by the teachers' organization and six by the superintendent.

The career levels are: intern, resident, professional, and lead teacher. Teachers who successfully complete their internship become residents until they are fully certified and tenured. Tenured, certified teachers are designated as "professionals"; this designation is a prerequisite for the lead teacher level. Lead teachers not only serve as mentors but also work as demonstration teachers, coordinators for staff development, heads of special projects, integrated curriculum designers, and adjunct instructors in teacher education. They are selected through a competitive process by the joint panel and must have seven years of teaching experience, five of which must be in Rochester. All lead teachers must have direct contact with students. Currently, 95 of the district's 2,600 teachers have been designated as lead teachers.

North Carolina

The School Improvement and Accountability Act of 1989 granted North Carolina school districts the opportunity to develop differentiated pay plans, and all 134 local districts in the state included differentiated pay in their 1990-91 School Improvement Plans. The General Assembly allocated $77 million to support differentiated staffing plans in 1990-91. This includes two sums: $38 million to the 16 systems that participated in a pilot program of the North Carolina Career Development Plan during the last four years and $39 million for the remaining districts. Funding to non-Career Development Plan pilot districts is based on state-funded salaries for certified positions.

The original legislation called for funding to be phased in over five years at 2, 3, 4, 5.5, and 7 percent of district-certified salaries (teachers and administrators.) Funding to Career Development Plan pilot districts was established by the General Assembly. It was intended to bring these districts from funding at 15 percent of state salaries to 7 percent at the same time as non-pilot districts attained the 7 percent.

Fiscal constraints caused the General Assembly to hold funding to the 117 non-Career Development Plan districts at 2 percent, rather than increasing it to 3 percent, of state-funded salaries for the 1991-92 school year. As a result of legislative action, total funding to non-Career Development Plan districts remained at the 1990-91 level of $39 million, and the legislature set aside $10 million of that for staff development activities. Funding to Career Development Plan districts continued at $38 million. (Also, the legislature did not fund teachers' and administrators' salary increases scheduled for the current year.)

Non-Career Development Plan districts were directed to poll teachers and administrators to determine if local educators preferred to continue implementation of their locally designed differentiated pay plans or to use the funds originally intended for differentiated pay for across-the-board raises, not to exceed a cap of $550 per person. (Districts had been prohibited from using differentiated pay monies for across-the-board raises in their original submissions.) Of the 117 districts, 18 voted to continue or modify their differentiated pay plans and the remaining 99 districts chose across-the-board raises.

The School Improvement and Accountability Act had special implications for the 16 school districts and over 6,000 educators that pilot-tested the North Carolina Career Development Plan in school year 1985-86 through 1988-89. Districts had the option of continuing to use the Career Development Plan as their differentiated staffing plan. To do so, they had to show how, by 1994, they planned to reduce program costs to the 7 percent funding level projected for full implementation of the School Improvement and Accountability Act and had to provide the results of a secret ballot that showed support for continuing the Career Development Plan. All 16 pilot districts continued with the Career Development Plan.

Each district had to submit a plan showing how it would implement a program as funds were reduced over the next five years. The majority of participants in the Career Development Plan pilot districts expressed the desire to maintain individual merit bonuses. Districts have bonuses, and, while some funds remained for other costs, districts have had to reduce or eliminate most other aspects of the program including: extended employment for teachers, staff development, peer evaluators, program coordinators, and clerical support.

In summary, fiscal constraints and associated legislative actions and local district actions have reduced the availability of state funds for differentiated pay plans. As a result, the number of districts experimenting with differentiated pay has gone from 134 to 34, including the 16 original Career Development Plan pilot districts.

North Dakota

In 1986, a state model for in-service education and staff development was adopted in North Dakota. The model is designed to guide local districts in meeting the professional growth needs of teachers. However, no state funding has been available to address the needs of veteran teachers.

Ohio

In December 1984, the Ohio State Board of Education adopted the Master Plan for Excellence, which called for the establishment of a career ladder and peer review program. The State Department of Education and Miami University conducted a study to determine the feasibility of implementing a statewide career ladder program. The study, completed in June 1987, suggested that districts should develop local incentive programs with state assistance and using state-adopted basic guidelines. For the 1991-93 biennium, the legislature provided $2,124,000 to continue previously initiated pilot incentive projects in the state. The Toledo

project involves a career ladder with six levels after the initial qualification stage. The initial qualification is based upon five areas--letters of reference, a written essay, an interview before a three-member committee, a lesson portfolio, and six classroom observations by three mentor teachers. Further movement up the ladder requires classroom observation and additional assignments. Teachers may opt to remain at the third level of the ladder, which requires periodic observation and the completion of one special project annually to hold that position. Requirements for the top two levels include a master's degree or graduate hours in an academic area.

The Cincinnati school district implemented the Career in Teaching Program, a four-step career ladder plan, with a $400,000 grant from the state for start-up costs over two years and $500,000 in district funds. Teachers with 10 years of experience (the last five in Cincinnati schools) are eligible to become lead teachers, receiving stipends ranging from $1,000 to $5,500 depending on the additional duties they assume. Selection is based on evaluations by other teachers as a part of the district's peer-review program initiated in 1985. By 1992-93, 10 percent of the city's teachers (about 340) will have the opportunity to be designated as lead teachers.

In June 1989, the legislature authorized the State Department of Education to develop a plan to phase in merit pay and career ladder programs statewide and submit the plan to the General Assembly by December 31, 1990. The Department of Education submitted Ohio's Plan for Phasing-in Career Ladder Programs to the General Assembly, though no action has been taken. The purpose of the plan is to guide districts in designing locally financed career ladder programs. The plan is broken into 14 areas, including goals and objectives for the career ladder program, eligibility requirements, selection process, criteria for placement and advancement, professional development activities, financial rewards, and program evaluation and revision. Districts developing local programs must address each of the 14 areas in their models. There are no immediate plans to seek state funding for the development and implementation of local models.

Oklahoma

As part of a comprehensive educational reform bill passed by the Oklahoma legislature in 1990, local boards of education in Oklahoma were called upon to adopt academically based, district incentive pay plans beginning with the 1991-92 school year. A referendum to repeal the law was defeated by voters in the fall of 1991. The local boards may adopt their own plan or choose one of five model plans developed by the State Board of Education. Plans may not permit more than a 20 percent increase in a teacher's salary for one year. A local board must also appoint an advisory committee consisting of teachers, parents, and local citizens to advise the board in formulating an incentive pay plan.

Beginning with the 1991-92 school year, a school district is required to adopt and implement an incentive pay plan when the local board of education receives a petition signed by 20 percent of the district classroom teachers calling for the adoption of an incentive pay plan. Local districts are also required to provide for a local evaluation committee to advise the board on which teachers are to receive incentive pay awards and the amount of each award.

Legislation passed in 1991 created an alternative certification program for teachers and also called a Task Force on Teacher Preparation. The task force presented recommendations in December of 1991 on preparation and licensure of teachers. The recommendations called for moving to an outcomes-based system for licensing teachers as well as recognizing and rewarding teachers who have achieved National Board certification.

In the Oklahoma City Public Schools, Project Phoenix is underway to improve education in seven schools that have been cited as academically troubled. (A statewide program identifies schools in which student achievement is below desired levels.) The superintendent made this statement, ". . . We had failed the children of these particular seven schools. That is unacceptable. . ." Schools were temporarily closed and opened with new staff. Teachers who accept positions in the schools receive a $300 bonus. An additional $400 is received if the school improves achievement and is no longer an "academically troubled" school. Other bonuses are available for improving student achievement and attendance in special academic programs. The district also developed a performance-pay package for central office and building administrators. To increase support services, central office employees will spend one-half of their vacation time working in low performing schools. Staff are eligible for bonuses based on increased composite or reading test scores. Principals and assistant principals may earn more than $8,000 through incentives based on student progress, teacher attendance, and schools being removed from the state list of academically troubled schools.

Oregon

The 1987 Oregon legislature passed a bill providing for a professional development and school improvement program designed to address four areas: 1) the development of educational goals for individual schools and districts; 2) the assessment of educational progress of school programs and students; 3) the professional growth and career opportunities for Oregon teachers; and 4) the restructuring of the school workplace to provide teachers with the responsibilities and authority commensurate with their status as professionals. For the 1987-89 biennium, $2.4 million was appropriated to support pilot projects developed by local committees at 70 schools across the state. Funds were allocated to provide $1,000 per teacher at each pilot site. For 1989-91, the legislature appropriated $4.6 million to continue this project and add additional sites; the pilot sites have been expanded to a total of 86 schools. The same level of funding in the 1991-93 biennium will provide up to $1,000 per teacher at 117 sites.

Within the same legislation, the Beginning Teacher Support Program was established to ensure that the induction of beginning teachers is conducive to professional growth and development. As outlined in the law, each district that qualified to participate in the program would receive $3,000 to support each beginning teacher. Biennial funding was provided at a level of $3.9 million; 650 beginning teachers and their mentors participated in the program each year of the biennium. Due in part to economic pressures and to a low turnover rate among experienced teachers, funding was reduced to $3 million for the 1991-93 biennium. Up to 650 teacher/mentor teams will participate and districts will receive $2,500 per team.

In 1989, the legislature adopted the 21st Century School Program to make fundamental changes to school operations and to formal relationships among teachers, administrators, and local citizens. Schools or districts submit plans to the State Department of Education that include proposed changes, for example, to curriculum requirements; graduation requirements; and the certification, assignment, and formal responsibilities of teachers, administrators, and other school personnel. The student learning and educational outcomes that are expected and a description of the statutes and rules that are to be waived to complete the plan must also be included. Required annual reports showing changes in student learning and other performance indicators are to be submitted to a state advisory committee and to the community.

In 1991 the legislature adopted the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, which declares that all students can learn and that a restructured educational system is necessary to achieve the state's goals of having the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a work force equal to any in the world by the year 2010. The Department of Education has received $2.2 million to formulate guidelines and develop cost estimates for the act's implementation by January 1993.

Pennsylvania

In 1984-85, the Pennsylvania State Department of Education awarded $4 million in grants to local districts for locally-developed efforts to improve instruction through training, to sponsor new programs developed by teachers, and to provide incentives for teachers. Nearly all of the state's 500 districts participated in the initial program, which received the same appropriation for 1985-86. For 1986-87, the state legislature increased the funding to $7 million; 67 of the districts developed incentive programs. Allocations were made after local districts submitted a written proposal for approval by the State Department of Education; funds were distributed according to a formula based on a pupil/teacher ratio.

With a change in the state administration, the scope of the program was modified for 1987-88--$4 million was appropriated for districts to promote effective teaching. Districts were awarded subsidy funding, based upon a formula, and could use the funds to support such programs as mentor teacher and continuing professional development. No funds were provided for incentive pay.

In 1990-91, $1.5 million was appropriated for the continuing professional development of teachers. These funds supported nine regional lead teacher centers. Approximately 8,000 leaders have been trained thus far. In 1991-92, the appropriation remained at $1.5 million to support the nine lead teacher centers.

Districts are required by law to implement school-based induction and professional development programs as a part of the state's certification requirements. Guidelines for these programs are provided by the State Department of Education and districts submit their plans to the Department for approval. Funds are not earmarked specifically for these programs; districts use formula funds to carry out the state mandate.

Legislation passed in 1988 created the School Performance Incentives Program. This program grants awards to schools demonstrating sufficient improvement in any of three areas: student achievement as indicated in statewide testing, reduction of dropout rates, and preparation for higher education as indicated by simultaneous rises in the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) participation rate and scores. Funds are allocated among the recipient schools in proportion to their numbers of full-time-equivalent teachers. Subject to the district school board's approval, the staff of the recipient school decides how to use the award to further improve education within that school. The program forbids use of awards for salary increases or bonuses to current employees. Early in 1989, this program distributed $5 million to 209 schools; in 1990, an identical sum went to 235 schools. In 1991, $4 million went to 861 schools. For 1991-92, $3 million was appropriated to continue the program.

Rhode Island

A beginning teacher induction program continues to be discussed. The Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education has annually included a budget request for $250,000 to fund pilot mentor teacher projects. Funding, however, has not been provided.

Staff in the Office of Teacher Education and Certification are working with a regional educational laboratory and other states in the Northeast to develop mentor teacher training materials. The proposed target date for pilot projects in the Northeast region was August 1991. Funding has not been secured and a new target date for implementing pilots has not been set.

The 1991 Rhode Island General Assembly enacted legislation which prohibits an individual being barred from certification as a teacher solely because of his/her score on any standardized teachers' examination. The law provides that the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education may require individuals who meet all the requirements for certification, except the teacher testing requirement, to undergo a successful job performance review, based on criteria established by the Board, annually for three years. The Board of Regents has directed the Department of Education to investigate a performance-based assessment process. The report on its findings will be available by summer 1992.

South Carolina

During South Carolina's 1991 legislative session, a *Campus Incentive Program* was established to reward faculty members of schools that demonstrate superior performance and productivity. Principals, assistant principals, all teachers, library media specialists, guidance counselors, psychologists, school nurses, and others, as determined by an advisory committee, will be eligible to participate in the program. Funding of $17 million was allocated, with $10.5 million of the funds to be spent to reward teachers and $3.46 million for principals and other faculty. The remaining $3.1 million "may be used by school districts and any school to compensate faculty for their time and effort in the area of school improvement and planning, and such activities as research, curriculum development, coordination of courses and special

projects, or other activities the faculty may wish to undertake for improving student performance, development, and learning and coordination of services with other social and health agencies."

The 20-member Campus Incentive Advisory Committee has been appointed by the State Board of Education, the state superintendent, and the governor. The committee will advise the State Board of Education on development and implementation of the program. The Campus Incentive Program is to replace two programs that were developed as a result of the Education Improvement Act of 1984. The Teacher Incentive Program (funded at $21.5 million in 1990-91) and the Principal Incentive Program (funded at $1.5 million) paid teachers and principals who earned awards in 1990, but will then be discontinued. The Teacher Incentive Program rewarded teachers under a bonus plan, and a campus/individual model. Criteria were based on superior performance and attendance, performance evaluation, student achievement, and self improvement. The Principal Incentive Program had rewarded principals who demonstrated superior performance and productivity.

The School Incentive Reward Program (also created by the 1984 law) is now beginning its seventh year. Legislation in 1989 made School Incentive Program awards (in two of three years) the primary criteria for granting flexibility to schools through deregulation. Approximately 26 percent of the 1,014 schools in the state received $5 million in rewards during 1990-91. Rewards are based on schools meeting criteria that include student achievement gain and improvement in student and teacher attendance. The achievement gain criterion must be met for a school to receive a reward; attendance rates qualify reward winners for additional funds.

Schools meeting all criteria received $32.78 per pupil, to be used for expenses related to instruction; funds cannot be used for staff salaries. Schools also received flags and certificates signifying their reward status. An additional 175 schools were awarded honorable mention status for showing improvement in achievement.

Individual student scores are tracked from one year to the next to determine progress. The student results are aggregated at the school level, and the top quarter of schools are rewarded in each of five comparison groups. The comparison groups are based on student backgrounds and school resources. Districts in which two-thirds of the schools were incentive winners receive an additional $2 per student. Vocational centers are eligible for rewards if their sending schools meet the student achievement criterion and the vocational center achieves three-year student placement rates of 50 percent or greater for 90 percent or more of their vocational programs. Two school districts and 28 centers received rewards in 1990-91.

The most recent survey of attitudes toward the program, conducted during the 1987-88 school year, found that most respondents regarded the program favorably; 90 percent of principals and teachers supported the concept of rewarding schools for achievement gains and 85 percent believed that goal-setting and hard work won awards.

South Dakota

In 1985, the South Dakota legislature enacted a career ladder for teachers and administrators, but implementation of the plan was blocked by a petition drive which, although not aimed at the career ladder, effectively thwarted the legislation of which it was a part. Originally, a three-level career ladder certification system would have been created. Provisions relating to only the first level in the original ladder have been retained.

Legislation passed in 1986 created a statewide induction program for first-year teachers and administrators. Under this program, first-year certificates were issued to new teachers and administrators. During the first year, each was assisted and evaluated by a team representing the local school district, higher education, and the South Dakota Department of Education. At the end of the year, the team either recommended full certification or another year in the induction program. For 1988-89, $300,000 in state funds were appropriated for this program. The legislation has been repealed; however, districts may continue or initiate mentor programs with local funding.

In July 1990, an ad hoc committee of 28 educators met to review administrative rules governing teacher education and certification. One of the most significant proposals to be submitted to the South Dakota Board of Education is the initiation of the teacher educator program, an incentive program for career teachers that will improve the supervision of student teachers and effectively provide assistance to first-year teachers. For 1991-92, the legislature appropriated $70,000 for the Department of Education to work with teachers who have elected to earn the teacher educator endorsement. Requirements for the endorsement include a 3-credit semester course in supervision/collaboration, three years of successful teaching experience, and recommendations from the university and the local school administrator. "Teacher educator" is a new class of teacher, responsible to the university for the supervision of student teachers and first-year teachers. Many of the teacher educators will have university faculty associate contracts.

Tennessee

Tennessee's Career Ladder Program is in its eighth year of implementation statewide. The program for 1991-92 has received an increased allocation of $94 million, of which approximately $88 million is used for Career Ladder salary supplements and extended contract payments. An additional $16 million is allocated for retirement benefits for educators. The program includes a three-rung ladder for teachers (general education, vocational education, and special education), counselors, librarians, school psychologists, speech and language specialists, school social workers, attendance supervisors, instructional supervisors, assistant principals, and principals. This year a system is being developed to serve consulting teachers.

Significant revisions in the evaluation system that have been developed and field-tested will be implemented during the 1991-92 year. The revisions are the result of a two-year development process with the following goals:

1. An emphasis on the improvement of instruction,
2. A scoring process more understandable to the candidate, and
3. Reduction in the length of time for the evaluation process and availability of results.

No changes were made in the competencies and indicators or the standards used in the systems, however changes do include:

1. A simplified score reporting process allowing for immediate feedback regarding scores,
2. Enhanced feedback regarding recommendations for improvement after each visit,
3. Thirty day evaluation cycle,
4. Completed process in 45 days,
5. A Summary Evaluation process which consists of a Candidate Interview, Team Appraisal, and Summary Conference,
6. Change in format of Observation Instrument,
7. Use of Student Questionnaire as an indirect data source, and
8. Simplified terminology and format of Professional Development Activities and Leadership Summaries.

Salary supplements range from $1,000 to $7,000, according to the Career Ladder level and length of contract. Presently, 43,000 educators are on the ladder, with 8,600 teachers and administrators at the upper levels. About 95 percent of all those eligible (educators must hold a professional license, have appropriate experience, and be in a Career Ladder position) are on the first level and about 28 percent are on the top two levels. About 1,000 teachers and administrators have applied for evaluation for the upper levels during 1991-92.

Teachers are evaluated by the local school district during their first four years and, if they are successful, receive a 10-year professional license. Educators may voluntarily seek Career Levels I, II, or III, based on evaluation of performance in the classroom or workplace and years of experience. Career Level I is determined by local district evaluation. Career Levels II and III may be determined by a three-member state evaluation team or an evaluation team composed of the teacher's principal and two state evaluators. The teacher may choose either evaluation model, but the principal and the teacher must both agree to the latter "combination" model.

Since 1989, educators who are not on the upper levels of the Career Ladder have been allowed to participate in the extended contract program. This program provides extra money to educators for additional work, primarily during the summer. A school district's extended contract program is based on student needs and may include adult literacy and extended school child care activities.

Texas

The 1991-92 school year marks the eighth year of the Texas Teacher Career Ladder. During its First Called Session in July 1991, the 72nd legislature appropriated an estimated $283 million for school year 1991-92 and nearly $288 million for school year 1992-93; these appropriations are based on a formula of $90 per student in average daily attendance (ADA) and represent the same level of funding as that of the prior biennium.

Teachers who have advanced to, or will be maintained on Level Two will be receiving salary supplements ranging from $1500 to $2000; teachers at Level Three will be paid an annual supplement ranging from $3000 to $4000. During school year 1990-91 an estimated 77,148 teachers were on Level Two and 47,596 teachers were at Level Three. Collectively, the teachers from these two advanced levels constituted approximately 61.4 percent of the state's 203,285 teachers.

In this state program teachers are advanced on the career ladder by performing well in the classroom as indicated by scores on the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS), by meeting specified job-related education requirements (professional staff development--either formal higher education courses or clock hours of workshops), and by meeting experience (tenure) requirements at a prior level. Performance appraisals are used to determine whether teachers are to be maintained on advanced levels.

At the request of the newly appointed Commissioner of Education, the legislature also authorized the development of a new initiative with primary focus on helping Texas schools to increase student learning outcomes for all students and to close the performance gap that exists among various student populations. This new effort, identified as the Partnership Schools Initiative, will cut across existing programs, delivery systems, and barriers or constraints and enable the state and participating districts to concentrate on:

1. the student;
2. the real world outcomes necessary for that student; and
3. the program or programs necessary for that student to reach the identified, desired outcomes.

In the Partnership Schools, the student learning outcomes will not be negotiable--only the education program or courses of study can be negotiated. One means of searching for the most effective way of providing appropriate programs will be the commissioner's authority to grant waivers from state statutes regarding the days of operation of the school program to provide up to 18 days within the school year for intensive professional staff development designed to accomplish the student learning outcomes.

Legislation passed during the July 1991 Special Session made changes in the Educational Excellence Program. The new program under development, Texas Successful Schools, will "recognize or reward those schools and school districts that demonstrate progress or success in achieving the educational goals of the state." Schools that demonstrate the greatest improvement in achieving goals will be presented financial rewards

by the governor. The program is funded according to a set amount for each student ($30 million has been appropriated for the biennium). Additional awards (non monetary) may be given to schools that have met or exceeded goals. The Commissioner of Education shall appoint a committee to determine criteria and recipients of the awards. Each school's performance will be compared to previous performance. In addition, each school district will develop plans for site-based decision making by December 1992. Training will be available to teachers, principals, and school board trustees. Teachers will participate in school intervention teams that will conduct on-sight assessment of low performing schools and work with school staff to develop school improvement plans.

Utah

Funding for Utah's Career Ladder program continues at $41 million in 1991-92, the seventh year of the program. Allocations to the state's 40 school districts are based on weighted pupils and the number of certificated educators employed by each district. District-designed plans are developed following 1984 guidelines established by the legislature. Additionally, Utah's five Applied Technology Centers and the schools for the deaf and blind receive line item allocations for their career ladder programs

The Career Ladder Program has four major parts: performance bonus, job enlargement, extended contact day, and the career ladder. The performance bonus recognizes and rewards excellence in the classroom. Job enlargement provides extra pay for extra work. Extended days provide for paid non-teaching days beyond the regular school year. Teachers are placed on the career ladder based on their experience and expertise. Previously, 50 percent of the total funding was required to be spent on the ladder, job enlargement, and performance bonus. Legislation in 1991 removed the 50 percent requirement and added a provision that will allow for teams of teachers to receive performance bonuses.

In 1991, 11 school districts received career ladder funding in a "block grant" allocation, which frees them from the normal program requirements and reporting. Evaluations will be conducted this year on the "block grant" part of the Career Ladder Program.

Vermont

As part of new certification regulations adopted by the Vermont State Board of Education, the 23-member Standards Board for Professional Educators was created. A majority of the board members are teachers; the others are administrators, school board members, and representatives of higher education. The board is not considering any career ladder concept or performance-based incentive program at this time. However, the board is responsible for establishing local standards boards in each district in the state to recommend license renewals for practicing teachers. The State Standards Board is also in the process of creating, with local input, a document that will describe the standards of model professional development experiences. The local standards boards, which have a majority of their members selected by educators, will approve each teacher's Individual Professional

Development Plan and determine the appropriateness of teacher learning activities to meet individual, school, and district needs. When a license is due to expire, local boards will review a completed teacher portfolio based upon that plan and make recommendations for renewal. These local standards boards have been in operation since September 1, 1991.

Virginia

During 1984-86, Master Teacher and Pay-for-Performance programs were piloted in Virginia. Six pilot sites were selected to field-test teacher pay-for-performance plans, a state initiative underwritten by $500,000 in state appropriations. The six original sites were Campbell County, Fairfax County, Hopewell City, Orange County, Prince William County, and Virginia Beach City. Prince William County school officials dropped out of the pilot study and the remaining five divisions continued the two-year test.

The test and the selection of dissimilar school divisions were designed to allow for considerable diversity in the development of plans for the project. Fairfax and Virginia Beach are large metropolitan areas, with large staff and active teacher education associations. Campbell and Orange are small rural school divisions with small staffs. Hopewell is a small urban center, close to a large metropolitan area. These divisions also differ in ethnicity, socioeconomic status, school population, and types of challenges faced by teachers and administrators. Therefore, the five pilot sites were fairly representative of the state as a whole.

As initially conceived, the two-year project would produce at least one well-defined model that could be used statewide. This model could then be disseminated under the auspices of the Virginia Department of Education. However, while the Board of Education supports the notion of pay for performance, the current budget has no funds for pay for performance programs.

Funds were appropriated by the 1991 session of the General Assembly to develop mentor teacher programs as a transition from the required Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP). Because funds for the transitional program were limited and the Department of Education wanted school divisions to feel a strong sense of ownership toward any program developed, the approach was to require competitive proposals for grant awards. Forty-one local school divisions received grants of $10,000 to develop mentor teacher programs that would address the needs of beginning teachers. It is anticipated that from the various approaches developed by the 41 school divisions, a resource book and other materials will be available to other school divisions in the state. Also, any additional funds that might be made available by the 1992 session of the General Assembly will be used to fund other competitive proposals submitted after July 1, 1992. The ultimate goal is to assist each local school division with a grant to develop or strengthen the local program for providing a structured and supportive entry into the teaching profession for individuals with no experience.

Washington

The Teacher Assistance Program in Washington, now in its seventh year, is operating with an appropriation of $2.3 million for the biennium (down from $3.7 million for the previous biennium). Currently, 600 teams (down from 1,000) of one mentor and one teacher or other educational personnel are being supported. Beginning personnel are involved in almost all of the 600 teams, though some may involve an experienced person (for example, a teacher re-entering the profession or one who is changing subject areas) with a mentor.

A program initiated three years ago, Schools for the 21st Century, provides grants to schools for developing innovative programs. For the 1991-93 biennium, the legislature again appropriated nearly $10 million. There are now 33 schools in the state that are supported by 21st Century grants. The proposals for the grants are developed at the school level with parent, teacher, and administrative input. The grants may be used, for example, to purchase equipment and supplies, provide in-service training for instructional staff, and pay staff for working additional days. It should be noted that all of the proposals added 10 days to the teachers' school year for staff planning and curriculum development.

West Virginia

Comprehensive legislation enacted in West Virginia during 1990 included several programs for teachers. A beginning teacher internship program (funded at $1.5 million) was established and guidelines have been developed. Support teams for beginning teachers include a principal, a county staff development council member, and an experienced classroom teacher. A requirement calls for the mentor teacher and the beginning teacher to have joint planning periods during the day. Mentor teachers have been trained and will receive $600 in additional compensation.

The law also called for a uniform, statewide system of evaluation, with development of a common evaluation instrument and training for evaluators. The legislation also established the Center for Professional Development and provided $2 million in funds. The Center will train teachers in developmental instruction, emphasizing grades K through 4, and will provide training on evaluation skills for administrators, principals, and mentor teachers. Also included is the Project for Instructional Renewal through Science and Technology (Project FIRST), which will assess the best ways to use and provide training for educational technology. During the summer of 1991, the Center for Professional Development held six summer institutes for "Teachers as Managers of Change." These institutes trained kindergarten and first grade teachers.

In addition, every school will have local school improvement councils that include the principal, teachers, parents, and other citizens. The councils can develop alternatives for the school, such as applying for waivers of policies and rules. Each school has a faculty senate with authority to develop school-based management procedures or policy. Decisions might include employment of new teachers, recognition of outstanding teachers, and development of the master curriculum. Each faculty senate decides how $150 of the $200 allotted to teachers for instructional materials will be spent.

Wisconsin

In 1985-86, the Wisconsin State Department of Education issued guidelines and standards to be used in the development of local district proposals for teacher incentive pilot programs, which might focus on awards, a career ladder, or first-year assistance programs for beginning teachers. Funding of $1 million was provided for the initial two-year period (1985-87). Eight proposals, involving 35 to 40 local districts, were initially funded. The pilots continued in 1987-88 with a one-year extension of funding at a level of $214,000. No further funding has been provided. A follow-up report on the pilot projects offered two conclusions.

- ★ Beginning teacher assistance programs work when they are planned, funded, and coordinated by the state. It is both appropriate and within the means of the state to ensure that beginning teachers are well prepared and supported during their first year.
- ★ Career ladder programs and teacher recognition awards do not benefit from state direction. The long-term career needs and resources of teachers in individual districts are so distinct from each other that these two kinds of programs should be developed when there is sufficient local interest and resolve to implement them effectively.

The State Department of Education was unsuccessful in securing funds to implement a statewide beginning teacher assistance program.

Wyoming

Although discussion continues relative to the consideration of merit in teacher compensation, no statewide action has been taken in Wyoming. Local districts have the flexibility to initiate teacher improvement programs from local funding.

State information compiled by Gale F. Gaines, Research Associate, and Lynn M. Cornett, Vice President for State Services, SREB.

1991 State Contacts

Alabama--Mary N. Hogan, Coordinator of Leadership and Management, Alabama Department of Education, 50 North Ripley Street, Montgomery, AL 36130 (205) 242-9833

Alaska--Edwin Westlund, Director, Educational Program Support Division (907)465-2900; Sandra Berry, Chapter II Coordinator (907) 465-2841; Alaska Department of Education, P.O. Box F, Juneau, AK 99811

Arizona--Linda Fuller, Career Ladder Program Director, Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007 (602) 542-5837

Arkansas--Deborah Walz, Special Assistant for Education, Office of the Governor, #1Capitol Mall, Room 205, Little Rock, AR 72201 (501) 682-2345; Maria Parker, Associate Director, Planning and Development, Arkansas Department of Education, #4 Capitol Mall, Room 401-A, Little Rock, AR 72201 (501) 682-4239

California--Jane M. Holzmann, Consultant, 721 Capitol Mall - Mentor Teacher Program, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 657-3357

Colorado--Carol Ruckel, Senior Consultant, Colorado Department of Education, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203 (303) 866-6853

Connecticut--Richard Vaillancourt, Consultant, Bureau of Professional Development and Learning Resources, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145 (203) 566-5750

Delaware--Robin R. Taylor, State Supervisor, Staff Evaluation, Department of Public Instruction, P.O. Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903 (302) 739-2771

Florida--Larry D. Hutcheson, Chief, Bureau of Program Support Services, State Department of Education, 844 Florida Education Center (904) 488-5270; Thomas Fisher, Administrator, Assessment, Testing, and Evaluation Section, 714 Florida Education Center (904) 488-8198; 325 West Gaines Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399

Georgia--Stephen M. Preston, Associate Director, Georgia Department of Education, 1870 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, GA 30334-5030 (404) 656-2008

Hawaii--Ronald K. Toma, Personnel Specialist, Certification and Development Section, Office of Personnel Services, State Department of Education, 1390 Miller Street, Honolulu, HI 96813 (808) 586-3269

Idaho--Michael L. Friend, Supervisor, Teacher Eduation and Certification, State Department of Education, Len B. Jordan Office Building, 650 West State Street, Boise, ID83720 (208) 334-4713

Illinois--Susan K. Bentz, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL 62777 (217) 782-3774

Indiana--George Stuckey, Director of Staff Performance Evaluation, State Department of Education, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798 (317) 232-9044

Iowa--Edith Eckles, Consultant; Sherie Surbaugh, Consultant; State Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146 (515) 281-3170

Kansas--Dale M. Dennis, Deputy Commissioner of Education, Kansas State Board of Education, 120 East Tenth Avenue, Topeka, KS 66612-1182 (913) 296-3871

Kentucky--Edward F. Reidy, Jr., Associate Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, 500 Mero Street, Frankfort, KY40601 (502) 564-4394

Louisiana--Sam C. Pernici, Director, Bureau of Progress Profiles/School Incentive Programs, State Department of Education (504)342-3756; Model Career Options Program: Marie Weiss, Acting Assistant Administrator (504) 342-1146; P.O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064

Maine--Mary E. Robinson, Director, Certification and Placement, State House Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333 (207) 289-5944

Maryland--John J. Jones, Acting Chief, Teacher Education and Certification (301)333-2155; A. Skipp Sanders, Assistant State Superintendent in Certification and Accreditation (301)333-2141; The Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore,MD 21201-2595

Massachusetts--Susan Zelman, Associate Commissioner (617) 770-7525; Cindy O'Callaghan, Education Specialist (617) 770-7618; Barbara Libby, Education Specialist (617) 770-7610; State Department of Education, 1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169

Michigan--Deborah Clemmons, Supervisor, School Improvement/Professional Development Office (517) 373-3608; Saundra E. Carter, Higher Education Consultant (517) 373-1926; State Department of Education, P.O.Box30008, Lansing, MI 48909

Minnesota--Marlys Peters, Curriculum and Instructional Specialist, 681 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101 (612) 297-2685

Mississippi--Robert H. Cheeseman, Coordinator, Teacher Education/Personnel Appraisal (601) 359-3772; Jim Hancock, Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification (601) 359-3483; Mississippi State Department of Education, P.O. Box 771, Jackson, MS 39205

Missouri--Janet Goeller, Supervisor, DESE, Urban and Teacher Education, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102 (314) 751-1191

Montana--Wayne G. Buchanan, Executive Secretary to the Board of Education (406)444-6576; Kathleen Harrington, Administrative Officer to the Certification Advisory Council (406) 444-7735; 33 South Last Chance Gulch, Helena, MT 59620

Nebraska--Robert Crosier, Director, Teacher Education/Certification, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 94987, Lincoln, NE 68509 (402) 471-2496

Nevada--Marcia R. Bandera, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative and Fiscal Services, State Department of Education, 400 West King Street, Carson City, NV 89710 (702) 885-3106

New Hampshire--Joanne Baker, Administrator, Bureau of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301 (603) 271-2407

New Jersey--Parthenia Cogdell, Director of Special Projects (609) 292-8692; Win L. Tillery, Director (609) 292-1544; Division of Direct Services, New Jersey Department of Education, 225 West State Street, CN 500, Trenton, NJ 08625

New Mexico--Susan Brown, Deputy Director of the School Management Division, State Department of Education, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, NM 87503 (505) 827-3876

New York--Charles C. Mackey, Jr., Administrator, Teacher Certification Policy, Office of Teaching, New York State Education Department, Room 5A-11, Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230 (518) 474-6440

North Carolina--Robert D. Boyd, Director; David Holdzkom, Chief Consultant, LEA Personnel Services; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 116 W. Edenton Street, Raleigh, NC 27603-1712 (919) 733-9230

North Dakota--Ordean M. Lindemann, Director of Teacher Certification, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 608 East Boulevard, Bismarck, ND 58505 (701) 224-2264

Ohio--Gregg Stubbs, Grants Coordinator, State Department of Education, 65 South Front Street, Room 611, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308 (614) 466-2979

Oklahoma--Paul Simon, Administrator of Teacher Education, Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, OK73105-4599 (405) 521-4908

Oregon--Joyce M. Reinke, Assistant Superintendent, Schools for the 21st Century Council, Oregon Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway, S.E., Salem, OR 97310-0290 (503)373-7118

Pennsylvania--Al Myers, Basic Education Associate, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 (717) 787-4860

Rhode Island--Louis E. Del Papa, Coordinator-School & Teacher Accreditation; Eloise L. Boyer, Education Specialist III, Rhode Island Department of Education, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908 (401) 277-6887

South Carolina--Diana Ashworth, Interim Director, Office of Policy and Research and the Office of Student Performance Assessment, State Department of Education, Rutledge Building, 1429 Senate Street, Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 734-8266

South Dakota--Clint Berndt, Office of Educational Accountability, 700 Governors Drive, Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 773-4770

Tennessee--Benjamin Brown, Director of Evaluation, State Department of Education, 542Cordell Hull Building, Nashville,TN 37243-0376 (615) 741-7816

Texas--Richard E. Swain III, Assistant Commissioner for Professional Development (512) 463-9328; James Salmon, Education Program Director (512)463-9327; Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701

Utah--Larry Horyna, Coordinator, Project Assistance Services, Utah State Office of Education, 250 East 500South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (801)538-7824

Vermont--Dick Dillon, Chief, Licensing and Professionsl Standards Unit, State Department of Education, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602 (802) 828-2444

Virginia--Dr. Thomas A. Elliott, Lead, Teacher Education, Virginia Department of Education, P.O. Box Office 6Q, Richmond, VA 23216-2060 (804)225-2095

Washington--John Brickell, Teacher Education Associate, Department of Public Instruction, Old Capitol Building, FG-11, Olympia, WA98504 (206) 753-3222

West Virginia--Tony G. Smedley, Coordinator, Professional Development, State Department of Education, Building 6, Room B-337, Capitol Complex, Charleston, WV 25302 (304)348-7826

Wisconsin--Kathryn Lind, Director, Beginning Teacher Assistance, Department of Public Instruction, 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, WI 53707-7841 (608) 266-1788

Wyoming--Jack F. Mueller, Director, Certification Unit, State Department of Education, Hathaway Building, Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050 (307) 777-6261